

VOL. XIX
PAGES 1794-1823

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Round The Capitol	1794
Committee Roundup	1816
Political Issues	1818
Residential Report	1821
Week In Congress	iv

No. 44

WEEK ENDING NOV. 3, 1961

'Divided Democrats'

- **Southerners Opposed Northerners
On 106 Roll-Call Votes in 1961**
Page 1806
- **Voted with GOP on 88 of These
To Form 'Conservative Coalition'**
Page 1796

Pre-Election Roundup

Page 1818

**Oldsters
Organize**
Page 1811

**Federal
Judgeships**
Page 1813

MID-YEAR BUDGET REVIEW

Page 1794

BY CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY INCORPORATED

The Authoritative Reference on Congress

1156 NINETEENTH STREET, N.W. • WASHINGTON 6, D.C. • FEDERAL 8-4660

REVISED ESTIMATES SHOW \$6.9 BILLION DEFICIT FOR 1962

The Kennedy Administration Oct. 29 issued its 1962 budget review which estimated total federal budget expenditures at \$89 billion and budget receipts at \$82.1 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, resulting in a budget deficit of \$6.9 billion.

These figures contrasted with former President Eisenhower's January estimate of a \$1.5 billion surplus in fiscal 1962 and President Kennedy's July 26 estimate of a \$5.3 billion deficit (see box). (Weekly Report p. 1303)

By March of 1961 the Kennedy Administration had already called the Eisenhower estimates "overly optimistic" in light of the current recession and said that the Eisenhower budget program would have incurred a deficit. As of July 26, President Kennedy had proposed new and expanded programs costing \$6.4 billion -- including more than \$4 billion for national security, international programs and space, and another \$900 million for alleviation of recession hardships.

The review said the deficit estimate had risen beyond the July figures mainly because: good weather boosted crop production, raising outlays for the Commodity Credit Corporation by \$981 million; Congress did not raise postal rates, costing the Post Office Department \$751 million; interest on the public debt would rise \$300 million; and activation of two National Guard divisions and other new military costs would rise \$210 million. These increases, it said, were partially offset by cuts in the President's foreign aid requests, and failure to enact a school bill and a manpower retraining program. (Not mentioned, but included in the cutbacks, was part of the \$780 million saved by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's refusal to spend extra funds voted by Congress for B-52 and B-70 bombers and Dyna-Soars. (Weekly Report p. 1379) Announcing the cutback, McNamara said these funds were not necessary because of "the progress of the Administration's accelerated defense buildup" and that the existing nuclear-armed striking forces "will be more than enough....if the need should come." Budget Director David E. Bell the same day said use of these funds would have added about \$200 million to spending in fiscal 1962 with the rest being spent later. Bell said the President was basing defense policies on military, not budgetary considerations. Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D Wash.) Oct. 31 said that the Administration was "taking an unnecessary risk" by refusing to spend the \$780 million.)

Included in the review was the text of President Kennedy's Oct. 26 statement to the heads of all Cabinet Departments and other Government agencies reviewing the budget situation and asking them to be "most careful and frugal with respect to commitments and expenditures under the 1962 budget." The President also stated that it was his "intention to propose a balanced budget" for fiscal 1963, "barring extraordinary and unforeseen defense requirements." (For text, see p. 1821)

The budget review employed novel as well as traditional methods of assessing the impact of the budget on the state of the economy:

- CONVENTIONAL BUDGET -- Under this yardstick, the \$6.9 billion deficit was projected.

- CASH BUDGET -- This accounting, also a traditional yardstick, shows all cash receipts from and payments to the public, including trust fund and other activities which are not included in the regular budget. Under this accounting, receipts are estimated at \$102.8 billion and payments at \$111.1 billion, or an \$8.4 billion excess of expenditures over receipts. Reflected here, and not in the conventional budget, is a \$1.1 billion net outgo in the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance trust fund, caused in part by a lag between the institution of increased benefits voted by Congress in 1961 (Weekly Report p. 1162) and the institution of increased taxes to pay for them.

- INCOME AND PRODUCT ACCOUNTING -- For the first time, the budget review incorporated this yardstick, although it is often used by economists. It differs from the other methods basically in timing -- it measures the economic impact of the Government's operations and services when performed and records tax collections at the point where the taxpayer sets the money aside for payment. This method is designed to give a more precise view of economic impacts at any given time. By counting as accrued fiscal 1962 receipts \$3 billion in taxes set aside in fiscal 1962 but not actually paid until fiscal 1963, and by excluding from expenditures \$5 billion in loans and transfers of assets, the review concludes that the 1962 budget as a whole would have a deficit of only \$200,000,000 and during the early part of calendar year 1962 there would be slight surplus in the national income accounts. This, according to the review, "may exert a mildly restraining influence on the economy."

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY SERVICE

Editor and President: Henrietta and Nelson Poynter.

Senior Writers: Elizabeth J. Brenner, John Jay Iselin, Robert C. Keith, William A. Korns, Carolyn Mathiasen, Helene C. Monberg, Ned R. Pearce.

Research Writers: Stephen Chatnuck, Ruth Hussey, Elizabeth M. James, Gladys Miller, Jonas V. Morris, David C. Niblack, Shirley Seib, Wayne Walker, Donald A. Webster, John Andrew Hamilton, Jr.

CQ Almanac Editor: Georgiana F. Rathbun.

Editorial Assistants: Margaret Carroll, Charles D. McCamey, Roberta E. Russell, James C. Whittemore.

Publisher: Buel F. Ware.

Business Manager: Walter E. Thomas.

Production Supervisor: Walter W. Conklin, Jr.

"The standard reference on the U.S. Congress for editors, scholars and reference librarians."

Copyright 1961 by Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1136 Nineteenth St., N.W., Washington 6, D.C. All reproduction rights, including quotation, broadcasting and publication, are reserved for current editorial clients. Second rights are reserved, including use of Congressional Quarterly material in campaign supplements, advertisements and handbooks without special permission. Rates are based on membership and/or circulation of clients and will be furnished on request. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

New 1962 Budget Estimates

(In millions of dollars)

Description	Receipts	Expenditures
January 16, 1961, estimated totals	82,333	80,865
March 1961 revisions in estimates of January budget program	- 1,800	+ 417
Recommended program changes proposed by President through July 25, 1961, and added revenues from economic activity generated by new proposals	+ 1,900	+ 6,441
July 25, 1961, estimated totals	82,433	87,723
Major changes from July 25, 1961, totals:		
Department of Agriculture:		
Farmers Home Administration	- 244	- 244
Commodity Credit Corporation		+ 981
Other		+ 76
Post Office Department		+ 751
Treasury Department -- interest on the public debt		+ 300
Department of Defense, military functions		+ 210
Foreign military and economic assistance		- 316
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare		- 327
Department of Labor		- 152
All other, net	- 89	- 17
Current estimate	82,100	88,985

¹ Under the 1961 omnibus housing bill receipts and expenditures under certain lending programs of the Farmers Home Administration were transferred to a new revolving fund; only the net expenditures will henceforth appear in the budget totals. This adjustment is being made in fiscal 1962 and requires an equal reduction of receipts and expenditures from the earlier estimate.

SOURCE: BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

• GNP -- Still another new official method of determining the impact of the budget was to measure federal spending in relationship to the gross national product -- the economy's total production of goods and services. Federal outlays for fiscal 1962 were estimated at 16 percent of the GNP, the same percentage as in fiscal 1961 and lower than in fiscal 1959 and 1955. The review also measured the public debt -- expected to be \$295.2 billion on June 30, 1962 -- as only about one-half of the GNP, the lowest in a steadily declining percentage since fiscal 1950. In fiscal 1948, it pointed out, the debt exceeded the GNP.

A few highlights of the conventional budget indicate where the federal dollars are going in fiscal 1962 in comparison with fiscal 1961 when expenditures were \$81.5 billion and receipts were \$77.6 billion, incurring a \$3.9 billion deficit.

Defense and Security -- The Defense Department's military operations will cost \$46.9 billion, up \$3.6 billion over fiscal 1961. Military assistance under foreign aid will cost \$1.5 billion, a rise of \$60 million. Civil defense spending will total \$211 million, \$153 million more than in 1961.

International -- Various programs of economic foreign aid will total \$2.5 billion, an increase of \$395 million over 1961. The conduct of foreign affairs and operation of the U.S. Information Agency will rise by \$486 million.

Civilian Space Programs -- Expenditures for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will be \$1.3 billion, \$591 million more than in 1961.

Farm -- CCC price support activities and surplus disposal programs will cost \$4.7 billion, an increase of \$1.2 billion over 1961.

Natural Resources -- Total costs for all natural resource programs will be \$2.1 billion, \$111 million above the 1961 total.

Health, Education and Welfare -- Public assistance programs will cost \$408 million more; expenditures for promoting public health will be \$1.2 billion, an increase of \$268 million, with almost three-fourths of this going for medical research and training programs at the National Institutes of Health; education programs will cost \$714 million, \$63 million more than in 1961, and including \$184 million for the National Defense Education Act and \$301 million for aid to federally impacted areas; labor and manpower programs, including temporary unemployment compensation will cost \$437 million in 1962, \$234 million less than in 1961. Other welfare expenditures such as school lunch, vocational rehabilitation and juvenile delinquency prevention will cost \$366 million, \$46 million more than in 1961.

Veterans -- Various veterans aid programs will cost \$5.3 billion, \$34 million more than in 1961.

General Government -- Certain Government-wide administrative costs and other outlays not allocated to major specific Government functions will total \$2.1 billion, \$206 million over 1961.

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- Oct. 30 -- Bell in a speech before the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants in Chicago defended the \$6.9 billion deficit as "acceptable and appropriate in view of the present phase of the business cycle." Bell said that continuing economic recovery should boost federal revenues for fiscal 1963 \$10 billion or more above the \$82.1 billion estimated for fiscal 1962. He said this rise in revenues "will be a big help in efforts to balance the budget in the face of expenditure increases above this year's estimated \$89 billion."

TAX PROGRAM

President Kennedy will again ask Congress in 1962 to repeal the \$50 exclusion and 4 percent tax credit on dividend income, enacted in 1954. This was disclosed Nov. 1 by Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Stanley Surrey, who said the additional revenue that would be produced by repeal of these provisions -- estimated at \$450 million -- was needed to achieve a balanced budget in fiscal 1963.

Repeal of the dividend provisions was one of several tax revision proposals sent to Congress April 20 by the President (Weekly Report, p. 687). The House Ways and Means Committee held extensive hearings but postponed final action on the matter until 1962. However, a tentative draft bill approved by the Committee made no provision for withdrawing the dividend-income privilege, and modified substantially other parts of the President's tax package, including the controversial investment credit provision.

The "comprehensive tax reform program" promised by the President April 20 will also be submitted in 1962, said Surrey, but the Administration does not expect Congress to act on this request until the following year.

'CONSERVATIVE COALITION' APPEARED ON 28% OF ROLL CALLS

The "conservative coalition" of Republicans and Southern Democrats in 1961 continued to be a potent force in Congress. (For definitions, see box)

Coalition Votes and Victories

The conservative coalition appeared on 88, or 28 percent of the 1961 session's 320 roll calls. This number is only partially indicative of the coalition's importance, as a number of the 320 roll calls in the House and Senate were on questions on which there was little or no controversy.

More significant is the number and percentage of the time that the coalition won. In the Senate, it won slightly less than half the time the two groups which form the coalition found themselves in agreement, and in the House it was on the winning side 70 percent of the time. Frequently in the Senate, and twice in the House, the coalition victories were made possible by the supporting votes of a minority of Northern Democrats. (See p. 1806)

The results for 1961 and the 86th Congress (1959-60):

	TOTAL ROLL CALLS	COALITION ROLL CALLS		COALITION VICTORIES	
		No.	% of Total Roll Calls	No.	% of Coalition Roll Calls
1961					
Both chambers	320	88	28%	47	53%
Senate	204	65	32	31	48
House	116	23	20	16	70
86th Congress					
Both chambers	602	116	19	74	64
Senate	422	86	20	57	66
House	180	30	17	17	57

Coalition Issues

President Kennedy came to office facing a House where Republicans had gained 22 seats in the 1960 election and where the potential coalition presented a powerful threat to his program. His job became one of cutting the coalition's strength by attracting Southerners (or Republicans) to his bills. The results show that he was only partially successful.

The only one of his "big five" programs on which the House coalition did not appear at all was housing; on depressed areas it made a stand against "backdoor spending" and lost, (in 1960 it had voted against passage of an entire depressed areas bill and lost); on minimum wage it won temporarily, but ultimately lost to the Senate; on school aid it was on the winning side; medical care did not come to a vote.

The Senate coalition appeared on all four programs which came to a vote, but won no important victory.

Definitions

- CONSERVATIVE COALITION -- As used in this study, the term "conservative coalition" means a voting alliance of Republicans and Southern Democrats against the Northern Democrats in Congress. This meaning, rather than any philosophic definition of the "conservative" position, provides the basis for CQ's selection of coalition roll calls.

- CONSERVATIVE COALITION ROLL CALL -- Any roll call on which the majority of voting Southern Democrats and the majority of voting Republicans oppose the stand taken by the majority of voting Northern Democrats. Roll calls on which there is an even division within the ranks of voting Northern Democrats, Southern Democrats or Republicans are not included.

- The Southern states are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia. The other 37 states are grouped as the North in the study.

- CONSERVATIVE COALITION SUPPORT SCORE -- Percentage of conservative coalition roll calls on which a Member votes "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote, even if a Member announces his stand, lower his score.

- CONSERVATIVE COALITION OPPOSITION SCORE -- Percentage of conservative coalition roll calls on which a Member votes "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Support and Opposition scores add to 100 percent only if a Member votes on all coalition roll calls.

The Senate coalition also formed on the key issue in foreign aid -- for regular appropriations as against the Administration-backed Treasury borrowing -- and lost; the equivalent House vote, where Treasury borrowing was killed, was not put to a roll call.

President Kennedy and the coalition were at odds on 44 of the 88 coalition votes, 31 in the Senate and 13 in the House. On the 44 votes where they differed, the President's position won out 26 times, 21 in the Senate and 5 in the House, and the coalition was on the winning side 18 times, 10 in the Senate and 8 in the House.

Listed below are the major issues on which the conservative coalition voted in 1961. In each case, the position of the coalition and whether they were on the winning or losing side on each vote involved is given. (In many instances, the size of the minority of Northern Democrats who voted with the coalition had a hand in deciding the outcome.) The roll call (RC) numbers refer to the list of roll calls beginning on page 4 of this study.

Senate

In the Senate, the coalition took these positions:

Civil Rights: Voted against prohibiting payment of obligated funds to airport terminal buildings with racially segregated facilities (RC 114); against making the Civil Rights Commission permanent (RC 161) or extending it for four years (RC 162); against federal financial assistance to school districts desegregating (RC 164); for postponing debate on a resolution to curb filibusters (RC 1), against closing off a filibuster on the resolution (RC 193) and against considering the resolution (RC 194). The coalition won on all seven votes.

Depressed Areas: Voted for financing the program by direct appropriation instead of Treasury financing ("backdoor spending") (RC 5), and voted to delete funds for public facilities (RC 9); lost on both.

Temporary Unemployment Compensation: Voted to have each state on its own in repaying, rather than an all-state "pooling" principle (RC 14), and lost. Voted to reduce benefits in accordance with a person's other pension benefits (RC 15) and to require repayment by employers in 1961-2 instead of 1962-3 (RC 16), and won on both.

Minimum Wage: Supported four amendments to cut the number of newly protected workers (RC 25, 26, 29, 30) and a move to require the Labor Department to suggest import quotas where U.S. goods suffered from relatively low wages abroad (RC 28); lost on all five votes.

School Aid: Voted against expanding the uses of general school aid to operating and maintenance costs (RC 45) and against passage of the bill (RC 54) and lost on both. Voted against cutting extension of impacted areas aid from two years to one year (RC 185) and won.

Housing: Took a position on several votes against the new moderate-income housing program (RC 59, 62, 70, 71, 72, 74) and ultimately lost; voted to reduce grants for urban renewal (RC 64) and lost and against raising the federal share of the cost of some urban renewal projects (RC 65) and won; voted against expanding the scope of direct loans to veterans (RC 68) and won; voted to delete the new "open spaces" program (RC 69) and won; voted to delete the new program of mass transportation projects (RC 66, 67) and lost on both votes.

Foreign Aid: Voted to require annual appropriations for the Development Loan Fund (RC 130) and lost; voted against a substitute amendment to authorize the loans, subject to a Congressional veto (RC 131) and lost; voted to reduce the amount that may be borrowed (RC 134, 137) and lost on one vote, won on the other; voted to cut the borrowing authority from five years to three (RC 141) and lost; voted to reduce the U.S. contribution to the UN for its Congo operation (RC 135) and reduce the military assistance authorization (RC 138) and lost on both; voted to require that half of the DLF loans go to private enterprise (RC 142), to bar aid to countries exporting arms and strategic materials to Soviet-controlled nations (RC 146), and against a limit on interest rates on DLF loans (RC 148) and lost on all three.

Mexican Farm Labor: Voted against an amendment designed to raise farm labor wages generally (RC 181, 182) and lost; voted against setting standards of work for both domestic and Mexican farm workers (RC 183) and won; and voted on four different questions for the conference report which dropped the provision to raise

wages generally (RC 199, 200, 201 and 202) and won on all four.

Election Reform: Voted against an amendment to the "clean elections" bill to require all political committees, including those in only one state, receiving or spending \$2,500 to report to Congress (RC 191) and won.

House

In the House, the coalition took these positions:

House Rules: Voted against expansion of the House Rules Committee to give Administration supporters control (RC 3) and lost.

Minimum Wage: Voted for a substitute bill which lowered the new minimum wage and drastically cut new coverage (RC 14) and won and against recommital of the substitute bill (RC 15) and won; voted against the conference report which rejected the House bill (RC 23) and lost.

Depressed Areas: Voted against the conference report which authorized Treasury borrowing ("backdoor spending") instead of yearly appropriations (RC 22) and lost.

Mexican Labor: Voted to extend the existing Mexican farm labor program without changes to protect domestic workers (RC 26) and won, and to send the bill to conference (RC 100) and won.

Reorganization: Voted against the President's proposals to revamp the National Labor Relations Board (RC 59) and Federal Communications Commission (RC 40) and won.

Public Power: On three occasions, voted against authorizing \$95 million for an Atomic Energy Commission plan to build an electricity generator at the Hanford, Wash., plutonium-producing plant (RC 69, 70, 97) and won all three times.

School Aid: Voted against considering, in effect killing, a general school aid bill (RC 84) and won.

Foreign Aid: Voted against raising the foreign aid military assistance authorization (RC 88) and lost; voted against permitting the President to withhold information from Congress if he lists his reasons (RC 116) and lost.

Culture: Voted against establishing a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts (RC 110) and won.

Coalition Support-Opposition Scores

Following are the composite Coalition Support and Coalition Opposition scores for 1961:

	Southern Democrats	Northern Republicans	Northern Democrats
COALITION SUPPORT			
Both Chambers	63%	70%	13%
Senate	67	64	13
House	61	74	14
COALITION OPPOSITION			
Both Chambers	26%	17%	75%
Senate	24	21	73
House	27	15	77

The above figures show that the average Southern Democratic Senator supported the coalition slightly more frequently than the average Republican Senator, while the average Southern Democratic Representative supported the coalition 6 percentage points less often than his Senate counterpart, and 13 percentage points less often than the average Republican House Member.

Conservative Coalition - 3

Regional Scores

The parties' composite Coalition Support scores, by region, for 1961:

	East	West	South	Midwest
DEMOCRATS				
Both Chambers	10%	15%	63%	15%
Senate	8	17	67	12
House	11	13	61	17
REPUBLICANS				
Both Chambers	59%	70%	69%	81%
Senate	53	68	53	78
House	64	72	82	83

The parties' composite Coalition Opposition scores, by region, for 1961:

	East	West	South	Midwest
DEMOCRATS				
Both Chambers	81%	70%	26%	75%
Senate	85	65	24	78
House	79	78	27	73
REPUBLICANS				
Both Chambers	28%	14%	16%	8%
Senate	32	16	28	8
House	25	13	5	8

The above figures show that among Democrats, Westerners and Midwesterners provided the Southern Democrat-Republican coalition more support than Easterners. This was more true in the Senate of Western Democrats and in the House of Midwestern Democrats.

Individual Scores

SUPPORT

Highest Coalition Support scorers -- those who voted with the conservative coalition most consistently in 1961:

Senate

Southern Democrats	Republicans
Thurmond (S.C.)	98%
Stennis (Miss.)	98
Jordan (N.C.)	95
Holland (Fla.)	95
Russell (Ga.)	94
Ervin (N.C.)	92
Talmadge (Ga.)	92

Northern Democrats

Lausche (Ohio)	63%	Hayden (Ariz.)	28%
Bible (Nev.)	46	Church (Idaho)	26
Cannon (Nev.)	38		

House

Southern Democrats -- Three scored 100 percent: Haley (Fla.), Kitchin (N.C.) and Ashmore (S.C.).

Others scoring high: (all 96 percent) Selden (Ala.), Gathings (Ark.), Whitten (Miss.), Forrester (Ga.), Alex-

ander (N.C.), Abbott, Gary and Tuck (Va.); (all 91 percent) Fountain (N.C.), Matthews (Fla.), Dowdy and Fisher (Texas), Downing and Smith (Va.).

Republicans -- Thirteen scored 100 percent: Bruce and Wilson (Ind.), Dole (Kansas), Langen (Minn.), Beermann (Neb.), Ray (N.Y.), Jonas (N.C.), Ashbrook and Betts (Ohio), Belcher (Okla.), Laird, Schadeberg and Thomson (Wis.).

Others scoring high: (all 96 percent) Gross (Iowa), Shriver (Kansas), Johansen and Meader (Mich.), King and Pillion (N.Y.), Brown, Latta and McCulloch (Ohio), Poff (Va.).

Northern Democrats

Hull (Mo.)	74%	Marshall (Minn.)	35%
Jones (Mo.)	61	Ichord (Mo.)	35
Cannon (Mo.)	48	Pike (N.Y.)	35
Fallon (Md.)	39	Monagan (Conn.)	35
Morris (N.M.)	39		

OPPOSITION

Highest Coalition Opposition scorers -- those who voted against the conservative coalition most consistently:

Senate

Southern Democrats	Republicans
Kefauver (Tenn.)	75%
Gore (Tenn.)	62
Monroney (Okla.)	58
Sparkman (Ala.)	58
Yarborough (Texas)	58
Hill (Ala.)	55

Northern Democrats

McNamara (Mich.)	95%	Humphrey (Minn.)	94%
Pell (R.I.)	94	Douglas (Ill.)	92
Williams (N.J.)	94	Randolph (W.Va.)	92

House

Southern Democrats	Republicans
Wickersham (Okla.)	78%
Albert (Okla.)	78
Patman (Texas)	78
Edmondson (Okla.)	78
Thomas (Texas)	78
Elliott (Ala.)	74
Burke (Ky.)	74
Perkins (Ky.)	70
Jones (Ala.)	70
Bass (Tenn.)	70

Northern Democrats -- Three scored 100 percent opposition: McDowell (Del.), Olsen (Mont.), Addonizio (N.J.).

Others scoring high: (all 96 percent) Dingell (Mich.), Thompson (N.J.), Healey (N.Y.), Green (Pa.), Cohelan and King (Calif.), Brademas (Ind.), Friedel (Md.), Karsten (Mo.), Addabbo and Ryan (N.Y.), Byrne, Nix and Toll (Pa.).

88 VOTES IN 1961 WHICH IDENTIFY THE 'CONSERVATIVE COALITION'

Following are the Senate and House votes for 1961 on which a majority of voting Southern Democrats joined a majority of voting Republicans to oppose the position taken by a majority of voting Northern Democrats, thus forming the "Conservative Coalition" which is the subject of this study.

The roll calls are listed in their chronological order by the Congressional Quarterly roll-call number.

Senate Roll Calls (65)

RC 1 -- S Res 4. Anderson (D N.M.) proposal to revise Rule 22 to enable three-fifths of the Senators voting, instead of two-thirds, to invoke cloture, shutting off debate on any matter. Mansfield (D Mont.)-Dirksen (R Ill.) motion to refer S Res 4 to Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. Agreed to 50-46 (SD 23-0; ND 9-31; R 18-15), Jan. 11, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 5 -- S 1. Area Redevelopment Act, authorizing federal loans and grants totalling \$394 million for the redevelopment of economically depressed industrial and rural areas. Robertson (D Va.) amendment to require regular Congressional appropriations rather than direct Treasury financing, for the three \$100 million area redevelopment loan funds in the bill. Rejected 45-49 (SD 14-9; ND 2-38; R 29-2), March 14, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 9 -- S 1. Lausche (D Ohio) amendment to strike from the bill authorization for appropriations of \$75 million for public facility grants to redevelopment areas. Rejected 36-55 (SD 12-10; ND 1-37; R 23-8), March 15, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 14 -- HR 4806. Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961, authorizing federal advances to permit the states to extend unemployment insurance payments for up to 13 weeks beyond the regular payment period for workers who exhausted normal benefits during the recession. Finance Committee amendment requiring each state to repay advances to it solely from taxes imposed on employers within that state, rather than establishing an all-state "pooling" principle. Amendment rejected 42-44 (SD 14-8; ND 2-31; R 26-5), March 16, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 15 -- HR 4806. Committee amendment requiring the states to reduce the weekly temporary benefits paid to an unemployed worker by the amount that person was drawing in any public or private pension except disability pensions or pensions for veterans 65 years or older. Amendment agreed to 51-38 (SD 17-4; ND 8-29; R 26-5), March 16, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 16 -- HR 4806. Williams (R Del.) amendment to finance repayment of advances by a temporary payroll tax increase imposed on employers in the years 1961-62, instead of 1962-63. Agreed to 45-42 (SD 11-10; ND 3-32; R 31-0), March 16, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 25 -- HR 3935. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961. Russell (D Ga.) amendment to eliminate all overtime and coverage changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act and limit the bill to raising the minimum wage for those already covered to \$1.15 an hour during the first two years in effect and \$1.25 thereafter. Rejected 34-63 (SD 14-9; ND 0-41; R 20-13), April 18, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 26 -- HR 3935. Holland (D Fla.) amendment to extend coverage only to 273,000 workers in seafood processing, transit systems, the merchant marine and small independent telephone exchanges. Rejected 35-62 (SD 14-8; ND 0-41; R 21-13), April 18, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 28 -- HR 3935. Goldwater (R Ariz.) amendment to require the Secretary of Labor to recommend import quotas or tariffs, which the President at his discretion could put in effect, if after investigation the Secretary determined that imports from

low-wage countries were endangering the living standards of U.S. workers whose wages were regulated by state or federal law. Rejected 39-55 (SD 12-11; ND 3-35; R 24-9), April 19, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 29 -- HR 3935. Monroney (D Okla.) amendment to revise the committee bill so that retail, service, gas-station, laundry and construction workers would be covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act not on the basis of dollar-volume-of-business test, but only if they worked in an enterprise with retail or service establishments in two or more states (this would have reduced coverage from 4,043,000 additional workers to about 2.5 million). Rejected 39-56 (SD 19-4; ND 1-39; R 19-13), April 19, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 30 -- HR 3935. Smathers (D Fla.) amendment to strike out provisions extending minimum-wage coverage to laundry workers (about 140,000 persons). Rejected 45-52 (SD 21-2; ND 0-40; R 24-10), April 19, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 36 -- S 1215. Amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Battle Act) to give the President discretionary authority to provide economic or financial aid to countries other than the Soviet Union or Communist-held areas in the Far East. Passage of the bill. Passed 43-36 (SD 8-13; ND 28-5; R 7-18), May 11, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 45 -- S 1021. School Assistance Act of 1961. Prouty (R Vt.) amendment to permit use of funds in the bill for operation and maintenance costs of public schools as well as for public school construction and teachers' salaries, and make voluntary the setting aside of 10 percent of the funds for "special projects." Accepted 51-39 (SD 9-14; ND 33-4; R 9-21), May 23, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 54 -- S 1021. Passage of the bill authorizing \$2,550,000,000 in grants to the states to be used for operation, maintenance and construction of public schools and for teachers' salaries. Passed 49-34 (SD 8-9; ND 33-3; R 8-22), May 25, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 59 -- S 1922. Housing Act of 1961. Capehart (R Ind.) amendment to eliminate provisions for 40-year, no-downpayment loans to public and non-profit agencies to build rental housing for moderate-income families. Rejected 41-50 (SD 12-9; ND 2-37; R 27-4), June 7, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 62 -- S 1922. Gore (D Tenn.) amendment to eliminate moderate-income sales and rental housing programs. Agreed to 49-44 (SD 16-5; ND 3-36; R 30-3), June 8, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 64 -- S 1922. Capehart (R Ind.) amendment to reduce by \$700 million the \$2.5 billion authorized for urban renewal grants. Rejected 38-55 (SD 13-10; ND 1-36; R 24-9), June 8, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 65 -- S 1922. Humphrey (D Minn.) amendment to raise from two-thirds to three-fourths the federal share of the cost of urban renewal projects in distressed area cities with a population under 150,000. Rejected 43-51 (SD 5-18; ND 34-5; R 4-28), June 8, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 66 -- S 1922. Lausche (D Ohio) amendment to delete the authorization for \$50 million in grants for mass transportation demonstration projects. Rejected 44-46 (SD 17-6; ND 5-32; R 22-8), June 8, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 67 -- S 1922. Humphrey (D Minn.) motion to table (kill) a motion by Dirksen (R Ill.) to reconsider the vote by which the Lausche amendment (above) was rejected. Tabling motion agreed

to 47-41 (SD 8-14; ND 32-4; R 7-23), June 8, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 68 -- S 1922. Javits (R N.Y.) amendment to permit direct loans to veterans in "housing credit shortage areas" instead of limiting the program to rural areas and small cities. Rejected 28-59 (SD 4-19; ND 19-16; R 5-24), June 8, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 69 -- S 1922. Case (R S.D.) amendment to delete the authorization of \$100 million to assist in creating "open space" areas in and around urban centers. Agreed to 46-42 (SD 15-8; ND 7-29; R 24-5), June 8, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 70 -- S 1922. Capehart (R Ind.) motion to table (kill) the pending Sparkman substitute amendment (RC 74, below). Tabling motion rejected 42-46 (SD 16-7; ND 1-35; R 25-4), June 8, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 71 -- S 1922. Bush (R Conn.) amendment to modify the Sparkman substitute amendment (below) by limiting below-the-market-rate rental housing loans to families displaced by government action. Rejected 45-46 (SD 15-8; ND 2-35; R 28-3), June 8, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 72 -- S 1922. Morse (D Ore.) motion to table (kill) a Gore (D Tenn.) amendment to modify the Sparkman substitute amendment (below) by reducing the term of sales housing loans to 30 years. Tabling motion agreed to 47-45 (SD 6-17; ND 36-2; R 5-26), June 8, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 74 -- S 1922. Sparkman (D Ala.) substitute amendment to restore in modified form the moderate-income housing provisions deleted by the Gore (D Tenn.) amendment. (RC 62) Agreed to, 47-42 (SD 6-14; ND 37-1; R 4-27), June 8, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 90 -- S 1154. Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. Mundt (R S.D.) amendment to eliminate discretionary authority to pay travel expenses of dependents of participants in exchange programs. Agreed to 47-42 (SD 12-8; ND 2-33; R 33-1), July 12, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 92 -- S 1154. Mundt (R S.D.) amendment to eliminate new authority permitting the President to make agreements with the United Nations and other international organizations to sponsor exchange programs. Rejected 35-57 (SD 11-10; ND 1-36; R 23-11), July 12, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 93 -- S 1154. Mundt (R S.D.) amendment to require specifically that not only loyalty questions but also possible security risks discovered in routine departmental personnel security investigations should be investigated fully by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Agreed to 53-35 (SD 10-9; ND 9-26; R 34-0), July 12, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 112 -- HR 7445. Independent offices appropriation bill for fiscal 1962. Proxmire (D Wis.) amendment to restore \$300,000 to GSA's Transportation and Public Utilities Service and remove certain restrictions regarding its activities before regulatory agencies. Rejected 32-55 (SD 2-17; ND 28-10; R 2-28), July 31, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 114 -- HR 7445. Mansfield (D Mont.) motion to table Javits (R N.Y.) amendment to prohibit the payment of obligated contract funds for airport terminal buildings containing racially segregated facilities. Tabling motion adopted 54-33 (SD 19-0; ND 18-19; R 17-14), July 31, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 130 -- S 1983. Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Byrd (D Va.) amendment to require annual appropriations for the Development Loan Fund. Rejected 39-56 (SD 14-8; ND 2-38;

R 23-10), Aug. 11, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 131 -- S 1983. Dirksen (R Ill.) amendment requiring the President to submit to the Senate Foreign Relations and the House Foreign Affairs Committees and the House and Senate Appropriation Committees loans of \$5 million or over, 30 days prior to entering into loan agreements, and permitting the Committees to report a concurrent resolution to disapprove the loan. Agreed to 52-44 (SD 8-14; ND 32-8; R 12-22), Aug. 15, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 134 -- S 1983. Lausche (D Ohio) amendment to reduce the borrowing authorization for fiscal 1962 from \$1,187,000,000 to \$900,000,000 and from \$1,900,000,000 to \$1,600,000,000 in each of the following four years. Rejected 46-46 (SD 15-7; ND 5-33; R 26-6), Aug. 15, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 135 -- S 1983. Ellender (D La.) amendment to limit U.S. contributions to United Nations operations in the Congo to 40 percent of the total contributions to the UN for the Congo. Rejected 44-51 (SD 16-6; ND 5-35; R 23-10), Aug. 15, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 137 -- S 1983. Ellender (D La.) amendment reducing the Development Loan Fund borrowing authorization for fiscal years 1963 through 1966 from \$1.9 billion to \$1.7 billion annually. Agreed to 51-43 (SD 14-7; ND 7-32; R 30-4), Aug. 16, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 138 -- S 1983. Ellender (D La.) amendment reducing the military assistance authorization from \$1.8 billion to \$1,550,000,000 for fiscal 1962 and 1963. Agreed to 57-37 (SD 18-4; ND 14-25; R 25-8), Aug. 16, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 141 -- S 1983. Capehart (R Ind.) amendment reducing the Development Loan Fund borrowing authorization from 5 years to 3 years. Rejected 45-50 (SD 13-10; ND 2-36; R 30-4), Aug. 17, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 142 -- S 1983. Capehart (R Ind.) amendment requiring that 50 percent of all Development Loan Fund loans be earmarked for private enterprises. Rejected 33-63 (SD 12-11; ND 1-38; R 20-14), Aug. 17, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 146 -- S 1983. Bridges (R N.H.) amendment barring assistance to countries exporting arms and strategic materials to Soviet-controlled nations. Rejected 43-45 (SD 12-7; ND 5-33; R 26-5), Aug. 18, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 148 -- S 1983. Sparkman (D Ala.) amendment in the form of a substitute to a pending Gruening (D Alaska) amendment requiring that development loans not be reloaned in a recipient country at interest rates considered excessive by the Development Loan Committee, and in no case at rates higher than the legal rate of interest in the recipient country. Rejected 38-53 (SD 10-11; ND 27-11; R 1-31), Aug. 18, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 152 -- S 1991. Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961, authorizing \$655 million for a four-year program to train unemployed workers. Prouty (R Vt.) amendment to authorize \$255 million for a two-year program. Rejected 43-44 (SD 12-10; ND 1-31; R 30-3), Aug. 23, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 155 -- S 1991. Passage of the bill. Passed 60-31 (SD 9-13; ND 35-1; R 16-17), Aug. 23, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 161 -- HR 7371. State-Justice-Judiciary funds for fiscal 1962. Mansfield (D Mont.) motion to table (kill) Clark (D Pa.) amendment making Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency. Tabling motion agreed to 56-36 (SD 22-0; ND 11-28; R 23-8),

Aug. 30, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 162 -- HR 7371. Mansfield (D Mont.) motion to table (kill) Clark (D Pa.) amendment extending Civil Rights Commission for four years. Tabling motion agreed to 48-42 (SD 22-0; ND 9-29; R 17-13), Aug. 30, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 164 -- HR 7371. Mansfield (D Mont.) motion to table (kill) Keating (R N.Y.) amendment authorizing federal financial assistance to help localities carry out school desegregation. Tabling motion agreed to 50-40 (SD 22-0; ND 12-26; R 16-14), Aug. 30, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 170 -- HR 6974. Amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to authorize owners of federally-subsidized vessels to finance research and design of ship equipment and machinery from their capital reserve fund. Butler (R Md.) amendment to eliminate the six percent differential preference granted to West Coast shipyards in bidding on certain ship construction jobs. Rejected 40-41 (SD 12-5; ND 9-27; R 19-9), Sept. 1, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 172 -- S 174. Establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. Ellender (D La.) motion to commit the bill to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee with instructions to report it back by Feb. 5, 1962. Committal motion defeated 32-41 (SD 10-7; ND 3-26; R 19-8), Sept. 5, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 177 -- S 2180. Establish a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. Goldwater (R Ariz.) amendment to eliminate the Agency's authority to conduct, support and coordinate research and development studies on disarmament. Rejected 43-46 (SD 14-8; ND 6-30; R 23-8), Sept. 8, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 181 -- HR 2010. Amend and extend for two years the Mexican Farm Labor Program. McCarthy (D Minn.) amendment to require employers of Mexican laborers imported under PL 82-78 to pay them at least 90 percent of the state average farm wage or 90 percent of the national average farm wage, whichever was less. Agreed to 42-40 (SD 3-18; ND 31-2; R 8-20), Sept. 11, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 182 -- HR 2010. Mansfield (D Mont.) motion to table reconsideration of the McCarthy amendment (above). Tabling motion agreed to 42-41 (SD 4-18; ND 31-2; R 7-21), Sept. 11, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 183 -- HR 2010. Keating (R N.Y.) amendment to require employers of Mexican laborers imported under PL 82-78 to offer similar terms and conditions of employment to Mexican and U.S. workers, including similar transportation and subsistence allowances, workingmen's compensation and a guaranteed number of work days. Rejected 35-49 (SD 0-22; ND 27-8; R 8-19), Sept. 11, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 185 -- S 2393. Extend laws (PL 815, PL 874) providing federal aid to school districts "impacted" by federal activities. Morse (D Ore.) amendment to pending Monroney (D Okla.) amendment to extend the impacted areas programs for one year instead of two. Rejected 40-45 (SD 1-18; ND 34-3; R 5-24), Sept. 12, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 187 -- HR 6775. Permanently legalize the use of dual-rate contracts by steamship conferences. Kefauver (D Tenn.) amendment to forbid agreements between conferences of carriers serving different trades that would otherwise be naturally competitive. Rejected 28-54 (SD 2-18; ND 22-12; R 4-24), Sept. 14, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 188 -- HR 6775. Kefauver (D Tenn.) amendments to prohibit a dual-rate contract which "is intended to" or which "will be reasonably likely to" or which "tends to" exclude or eliminate any other carrier from the trade. Rejected 33-45 (SD 9-11; ND 19-11; R 5-23), Sept. 14, 1961. The President did

not take a position on the amendments. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 191 -- S 2426. The Federal Elections Act of 1961. Long (D Mo.) amendment to require any political committee, including committees operating in only one state, that received or spent \$2,500 to file reports with Congress. Rejected 30-43 (SD 3-15; ND 18-13; R 9-15), Sept. 15, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 193 -- S Res 4. Change the Senate rules to allow three-fifths (instead of two-thirds) of those present and voting to invoke cloture and limit debate. Mansfield (D Mont.) - Dirksen (R Ill.) motion to invoke cloture on debate on a Mansfield motion to consider the resolution (two-thirds majority required). Cloture rejected, 37-43 (SD 0-22; ND 26-6; R 11-15), Sept. 19, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 194 -- S Res 4. Mansfield motion to table (kill) his earlier motion to consider the resolution. Tabling motion agreed to 46-35 (SD 22-1; ND 8-24; R 16-10), Sept. 19, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 195 -- HR 8444. Establish voting machinery to permit District of Columbia residents to participate in Presidential elections, in accordance with the 23rd (D.C. Suffrage) Amendment to the Constitution. Keating (R N.Y.) - Kefauver (D Tenn.) amendment to reduce the residence requirement from one year to 90 days. Rejected 28-49 (SD 2-20; ND 17-14; R 9-15), Sept. 19, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 196 -- HR 8444. Randolph (D W.Va.) amendment to reduce the residence requirement from one year to six months. Rejected 33-43 (SD 2-19; ND 20-10; R 11-14), Sept. 19, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 197 -- HR 8444. Long (D La.) amendment to make 21 (instead of 18) the minimum voting age in the District. Agreed to 38-36 (SD 16-4; ND 7-22; R 15-10), Sept. 19, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 199 -- HR 2010. Extend the Mexican farm labor law (PL 82-78) for two years, through Dec. 31, 1963. McCarthy (D Minn.) motion to table (kill) the conference report. Tabling motion rejected 34-40 (SD 4-19; ND 21-4; R 9-17), Sept. 21, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 200 -- HR 2010. Jordan (D N.C.) motion to table (kill) a Keating (R N.Y.) motion to reconsider McCarthy motion (above). Tabling motion agreed to 38-33 (SD 18-3; ND 4-22; R 16-8), Sept. 22, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 201 -- HR 2010. Jordan (D N.C.) motion to table (kill) a Keating (R N.Y.) motion to defer consideration of the conference report until Jan. 19, 1962. Tabling motion agreed to 43-30 (SD 22-0; ND 5-24; R 16-6), Sept. 22, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 202 -- HR 2010. Conference report, extending the Mexican farm labor law (PL 82-78) for two years, through Dec. 31, 1963. Agreed to 41-31 (SD 19-3; ND 6-21; R 16-7), Sept. 23, 1961. The President did not take a position on the conference report. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

House Roll Calls (23)

RC 3 -- H Res 127. Enlarge the House Rules Committee from 12 members to 15, increasing the Democratic membership by two and the Republican by one. Adopted 217-212 (SD 47-63; ND 148-1; R 22-148) Jan. 31, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 14 -- HR 3935. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961. Committee version, raising the minimum wage for 23.9 million workers already covered from \$1 an hour to \$1.25 in two steps, and extending minimum wage and overtime coverage to 4,311,000 additional workers. Ayres (R Ohio)-Kitchin (D N.C.) amendment substituting a new text raising the minimum for the 23.9 million covered workers to \$1.15 an hour, and extending

minimum-wage coverage (at \$1 an hour) but not overtime coverage to 1,300,000 additional workers. Agreed to 216-203 (SD 72-32; ND 2-145; R 142-26) March 24, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 15 -- HR 3935. Hiestand (R Calif.) motion to recommit the bill. Rejected 196-224 (SD 31-73; ND 141-6; R 24-145) March 24, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 22 -- S 1. Area Redevelopment Act, authorizing \$394 million in federal loans and grants for redevelopment of economically depressed industrial and rural areas. Adoption of the conference report, which called for financing \$300 million in loan funds directly from the Treasury instead of by Congressional appropriations. Agreed to 224-193 (SD 52-53; ND 141-3; R 31-137) April 26, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 23 -- HR 3935. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961. Conference report, raising the minimum wage for 23.9 million workers already covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act to \$1.25 an hour, reached in two steps over two years, and extending minimum wage coverage (at \$1.25 an hour, reached after four years) and overtime coverage (with some exceptions) to about 3,624,000 additional workers, mainly in the retail trades. Conference report agreed to 230-196 (SD 47-58; ND 150-0; R 33-138) May 3, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 26 -- HR 2010. Extend for two years, without change, the law permitting Mexicans to enter the U.S. for farm work. (PL 82-78). Passed 231-157 (SD 86-9; ND 29-106; R 116-42) May 11, 1961. The President did not take a position on the bill. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 39 -- HR 7053. Qualify a 1957 Supreme Court decision in the Mallory case, dealing with unnecessary delay in arraignments, to provide that, in District of Columbia courts, evidence should not be inadmissible solely because of a delay in arraignment. Lindsay (R N.Y.) motion to recommit the bill to the District of Columbia Committee. Rejected 104-252 (SD 1-94; ND 92-28; R 11-130) June 12, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 40 -- H Res 303. Resolution disapproving the President's Reorganization Plan for the Federal Communications Commission. Resolution of disapproval agreed to 323-77 (SD 98-3; ND 65-74; R 160-0), June 15, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 49 -- HR 7851. Defense appropriations for fiscal 1962. Saylor (R Pa.) amendment to delete a provision, submitted in the President's defense budget, prohibiting price differentials in favor of economically depressed areas. Rejected 173-239 (SD 13-86; ND 105-39; R 55-114) June 28, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 52 -- H Res 334. Authorize a special flag for Members of Congress to be flown from cars and ships. Rejected 108-270 (SD 15-82; ND 71-63; R 22-125), June 29, 1961. The President did not take a position on the resolution. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 59 -- H Res 328. Resolution disapproving the President's Reorganization Plan for the National Labor Relations Board. Resolution of disapproval adopted 231-179 (SD 73-30; ND 5-137; R 153-12), July 20, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 69 -- HR 7576. Atomic Energy Commission authorization for fiscal 1962. Cannon (D Mo.) motion to table (kill) Van Zandt (R Pa.) motion to instruct House conferees not to agree to a Senate amendment authorizing \$95 million to add generating facilities to the Hanford, Wash., plutonium-producing reactor. Tabling motion rejected 164-235 (SD 36-58; ND 120-22; R 8-155), Aug. 8, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's

position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 70 -- HR 7576. Van Zandt (R Pa.) motion (above). Agreed to 235-164 (SD 59-35; ND 22-120; R 154-9), Aug. 8, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 83 -- HR 6242. Authorize the Attorney General to fix the salaries of U.S. attorneys, special assistants, and other attorneys in the Justice Department without regard to wage ceilings in the 1949 Classification Act. Rejected 172-223 (SD 40-58; ND 116-19; R 16-146), Aug. 29, 1961. The President did not take a position on the bill. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 84 -- HR 8890. Emergency Educational Aid Act of 1961, authorizing a one-year, \$325 million program of school construction assistance; a one-year continuation of student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act; and a one-year extension of "impacted areas" aid. Hebert (D La.) question, under Calendar Wednesday procedure, on whether the bill should be considered. Consideration rejected 170-242 (SD 32-71; ND 132-11; R 6-160), Aug. 30, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 85 -- HR 8028. Authorize \$10 million annually for three years for conducting pilot projects and training personnel for controlling juvenile delinquency. Griffin (R Mich.) amendment to limit all pilot demonstration projects to the District of Columbia. Rejected 187-217 (SD 52-46; ND 3-142; R 132-29), Aug. 30, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 88 -- HR 9033. Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act of 1961. Passman (D La.) amendment as amended by Ford (R Mich.), increasing the military aid appropriation from \$1.3 billion to \$1.6 billion in fiscal 1962. (The Passman amendment would have increased the military aid appropriation for fiscal 1962 from \$1.3 billion to \$1,475,000,000.) Agreed to 243-151 (SD 40-58; ND 130-11; R 73-82), Sept. 5, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 91 -- HR 8723. Amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 to provide for its more effective enforcement. Powell (D N.Y.) motion to pass the bill under suspension of the rules (two-thirds majority required). Rejected 245-161 (SD 47-52; ND 127-15; R 71-94), Sept. 6, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 97 -- HR 7576. Authorize \$328,440,000 for construction by the Atomic Energy Commission. Adoption of the conference report, which authorized \$58 million to add electric generating facilities to a plutonium production reactor at Hanford, Wash. Report rejected 157-251 (SD 37-61; ND 109-34; R 11-156), Sept. 13, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 100 -- H Res 455. Resolution to send HR 2010, extending the Mexican farm labor program for two years, to conference. Adopted 243-135 (SD 92-7; ND 29-102; R 122-26), Sept. 15, 1961. The President did not take a position on the resolution. A "yea" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 110 -- HR 4172. Establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. Rejected 166-173 (SD 29-58; ND 106-14; R 31-101), Sept. 21, 1961. The President did not take a position on the bill. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 114 -- HR 258. Amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act. Reconsideration of the conference report, which excluded a provision making D.C. schools eligible for aid under the "impacted" areas program (PL 874). Rejected 97-173 (SD 28-43; ND 62-40; R 7-90), Sept. 26, 1961. The President did not take a position on the bill. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

RC 116 -- HR 9033. Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act for fiscal 1962. Senate amendment permitting the President to withhold foreign aid information requested for Congressional examination if he certifies his reason for doing so. Agreed to 152-119 (SD 30-38; ND 100-9; R 22-72), Sept. 26, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position. A "nay" was a vote supporting the coalition's position.

Conservative Support-Opposition Scores

Senate Conservative Coalition - 1961 and 86th Congress

The chart below shows how often individual Senators voted "with" and "against" the conservative coalition. The figures are based on Senate roll calls on which the majority of voting Republicans and the majority of voting Southern Democrats, forming a conservative coalition, opposed the stand taken by the majority of voting Northern Democrats.

1. CONSERVATIVE COALITION SUPPORT, 1961. Percentage of 65 conservative coalition roll calls on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
 2. CONSERVATIVE COALITION OPPOSITION, 1961. Percentage of 65 conservative coalition roll calls on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
 3. CONSERVATIVE COALITION SUPPORT, 86th Congress. Percentage of 86 conservative coalition roll calls in 1959 and 1960 on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
 4. CONSERVATIVE COALITION OPPOSITION, 86th Congress. Percentage of 86 conservative coalition roll calls in 1959 and 1960 on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

* Not eligible for all 65 test roll calls in 1961.

† Not eligible for all 86 test roll calls, in 86th Congress.

-- Not a Member during 86th Congress.

Score as Member of House during 86th Congress.

****** Missed roll calls in 1961 because of their illness or illness or death in the family.

1 2 3 4					1 2 3 4					1 2 3 4					CONSERVATIVE COALITION 1961 and 86th CONGRESS				
ALABAMA		INDIANA		NEBRASKA		SOUTH CAROLINA		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4	
Hill	43	55	50	44	Hartke	9	69	16	64	Curtis	82	0	94	6	Johnston	65	32	62	35
Sparkman	37	58	45	40	Capehart	77	8	65	10	Hruska	85	3	83	6	Thurmond	98	2	94	3
ALASKA		IOWA		NEVADA		SOUTH DAKOTA		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4	
Bartlett	11	78	19	74	Hickenlooper	82	6	93	1	Bible	46	52	56	40	Case	86	12	66	14
Gruening	20	51	16	78	Miller	82	3	--	--	Cannon	38	54	42	56	Mundt	95	3	76	13
ARIZONA		KANSAS		NEW HAMPSHIRE		TENNESSEE		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4	
Hayden**	28	54	58	31	Carlson**	63	2	77	13	Bridges**	40	0	70	2	Gore	28	62	24	66
Goldwater	57	3	67	3	Schoepel	82	2	81	8	Cotton	91	0	87	3	Kefauver	15	75	19	51
ARKANSAS		KENTUCKY		NEW JERSEY		TEXAS		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4	
Fulbright	52	35	53	26	Cooper**	43	51	43	53	Williams	5	94	9	84	Barbourough	23	58	23	67
McClellan	89	2	97	1	Morton	49	18	73	16	Case	12	83	36	59	Tower	77*	8*	--	--
CALIFORNIA		LOUISIANA		NEW MEXICO		UTAH		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4	
Engle	22	72	10	85	Ellender	78	12	81	10	Anderson**	17	43	34	52	Moss	11	69	12	73
Kuchel	57	42	50	43	Long	48	43	53	42	Chavez**	2	12	33	30	Bennett	92	0	80	3
COLORADO		MAINE		NEW YORK		VERMONT		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4	
Carroll	5	74	0	98	Muskie	8	80	13	67	Javits	11	80	30	66	Aiken	45	34	55	36
Allott**	51	3	76	17	Smith	66	34	57	43	Keating	37	63	47	51	Prouty**	54	28	69	26
CONNECTICUT		MARYLAND		NORTH CAROLINA		VIRGINIA		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4	
Dodd	15	69	15	65	Beall	69	18	66	23	Ervin	92	5	85	7	Byrd	88	2	94	0
Bush**	45	32	74	21	Butler**	60	0	79	5	Jordan	95	2	85	3	Robertson**	80	2	97	0
DELAWARE		MASSACHUSETTS		NORTH DAKOTA		WASHINGTON		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4	
Boggs	60	35	--	--	Smith	0	85	--	--	Burdick	8	75	--	--	Jackson	12	88	5	92
Williams	89	11	93	7	Saltonstall	63	15	79	16	Young	82	11	76	17	Magnuson	15	78	6	80
FLORIDA		MICHIGAN		OHIO		WEST VIRGINIA		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4	
Holland	95	5	92	2	Hart	0	89	3	92	Lausche	63	31	65	35	Byrd	20	80	42	56
Smathers	82	14	62	14	McNamara	2	95	1	81	Young	12	83	12	84	Randolph	5	92	20	69
GEORGIA		MINNESOTA		OKLAHOMA		RHODE ISLAND		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4	
Russell	94	0	83	6	Humphrey	0	94	1	71	Kerr	46	37	55	34	Proxmire	23	75	6	90
Talmadge	92	6	86	5	McCarthy**	9	71	3	79	Monrone	40	58	28	66	Wiley**	46	35	53	23
HAWAII		MISSISSIPPI		OREGON		PENNSYLVANIA		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4	
Long	12	80	9†	87†	Eastland	88	2	78	2	Morse	3	82	2	84	Clark	8	82	6	85
Fong	51	46	6†	31†	Stennis	98	2	98	0	Neuberger	2	66	--	--	Scott	46	51	55	44
IDAHO		MISSOURI		RHODE ISLAND		WYOMING		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4	
Church	26	63	13	63	Long	2	78	--	--	Pastore	9	91	16	77	Hickey	18	65	--	--
Dworsak	98	2	90	3	Symington	6	86	6	73	Pell	6	94	--	--	McGee	20	75	19	65
ILLINOIS		MONTANA		RHODE ISLAND		WYOMING		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4	
Douglas	6	92	5	90	Mansfield	15	72	23	69	Pastore	9	91	16	77	Hickey	18	65	--	--
Dirksen**	71	9	87	3	Metcalf	11	77	0	90†	Pell	6	94	--	--	McGee	20	75	19	65

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics

Conservative Support-Opposition Scores

House Conservative Coalition - 1961 and 86th Congress

The chart below shows how often individual Representatives voted "with" and "against" the conservative coalition. The figures are based on House roll calls on which the majority of voting Republicans and the majority of voting Southern Democrats, forming a conservative coalition, opposed the stand taken by the majority of voting Northern Democrats.

1. CONSERVATIVE COALITION SUPPORT, 1961. Percentage of 23 conservative coalition roll calls on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
2. CONSERVATIVE COALITION OPPOSITION, 1961. Percentage of 23 conservative coalition roll calls on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
3. CONSERVATIVE COALITION SUPPORT, 86th Congress. Percentage of 30 conservative coalition roll calls on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
4. CONSERVATIVE COALITION OPPOSITION, 86th Congress. Percentage of 30 conservative coalition roll calls on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

* Not eligible for all 23 test roll calls in 1961.

† Not eligible for all 30 test roll calls in the 86th Congress.

-- Not a Member during 86th Congress.

** Missed roll calls in 1961 because of their illness or illness or death in the family.

	1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4
ALABAMA					HAWAII					KANSAS				
3 Andrews	78	22	60	7	19 Holifield	9	74	0	93	6 Coad	9	78	17	77
1 Boykin	65	9	50	10	17 King	4	96	3	97	5 Smith	9	87	13	87
7 Elliott	26	74	23	57	26 Roosevelt	9	74	0	97	2 Bromwell	87	9	--	--
2 Grant	74	13	53	10	16 Bell	78	4	--	--	3 Gross	96	4	90	10
9 Huddleston	65	26	83	17	21 Hiestand	78	9	93	0	8 Hoeven	74	0	97	3
8 Jones	30	70	40	50	18 Hosmer	65	4	87	13	7 Jensen	83	9	83	7
5 Rains	22	30	40	27	24 Lipscomb	87	4	97	3	4 Kyl	74	9	89	11†
4 Roberts**	17	39	47	10	15 McDonough	74	0	93	3	1 Schwengel	65	35	77	23
6 Selden	96	4	97	3	25 Rousselot	91	0	--	--	KENTUCKY				
ALASKA					20 Smith	83	0	97	3	3 Burke**	17	74	27	73
AL Rivers**	13	83	17	80	19 Holifield	9	74	0	93	4 Chaff	57	39	37	17
ARIZONA					17 King	4	96	3	97	2 Natcher	43	57	43	57
2 Udall M.	12*	88	--	--	26 Roosevelt	9	74	0	97	7 Perkins	30	70	13	87
1 Rhodes	87	13	93	7	16 Bell	78	4	--	--	5 Spence	35	65	27	63
ARKANSAS					21 Hiestand	78	9	93	0	1 Stubblefield	35	57	40	60
5 Alford**	78	4	77	7	18 Hosmer	65	4	87	13	6 Watts	48	39	40	60
1 Gathings	96	4	97	3	24 Lipscomb	87	4	97	3	8 Silvers**	48	17	50	43
4 Harris	70	22	80	13	15 McDonough	74	0	93	3	LOUISIANA				
2 Mills	65	35	70	30	25 Rousselot	91	0	--	--	2 Boggs	22	43	43	40
6 Norrell C.	70*	5*	--	--	20 Smith	83	0	97	3	4 Brooks	45*	10*	87	7
3 Trimble	30	65	50	50	19 Holifield	9	74	0	93	1 Hebert	57	4	53	3
CALIFORNIA					17 King	4	96	3	97	8 McSweeney	61	4	77	7
7 Cohelan	4	96	0	97	26 Roosevelt	9	74	0	97					
14 Hagen	17	83	13	83	16 Anderson	91	0	--	--					
2 Johnson**	4	91	0	100	17 Arends	83	9	83	3					
11 McFall	17	83	7	93	19 Chipperfield	83	13	83	3					
1 Miller C.	17	70	0	93	20 Finley	91	0	--	--					
8 Miller G.P.	13	83	0	83	14 Hoffman	91	0	97	3					
3 Moss**	13	74	7	93	15 Mason	70	4	80	0					
29 Saund	13	70	7	90	16 Michel	78	9	100	0					
5 Shelley**	9	74	3	87	22 Springer	65	13	97	3					
27 Sheppard	13	52	17	57	1 Dawson	9	65	3	87					
12 Sisk	17	74	0	100	12 Finnegan	9	87	--	--					
6 Baldwin	57	43	63	37	5 Kluczynski	9	87	13	77					
10 Gubser	91	9	87	13	7 Libonati**	22	52	13	87					
4 Mailliard	52	30	67	30	3 Murphy	13	87	7	93					
13 Teague	83	4	100	0	6 O'Brien	13	87	7	87					
28 Ull	83	0	100	0	2 O'Hara	13	87	3	97					
30 Wilson	74	4	87	10	11 Pucinski**	13	87	7	93					
9 Younger	83	0	90	0	8 Rostenkowski	9	83	3	90					
Los Angeles Co.					9 Yates	9	91	7	90					
22 Corman	9	83	--	--	13 Church	78	13	83	17					
23 Doyle	17	83	13	80	10 Collier	83	9	90	10					
					4 Derwinski	87	4	90	10					
					3 Brademas	4	96	3	97					
					8 Denton	26	74	10	90					
					2 Halleck	70	9	90	3					
					1 Madden**	13	65	7	87					
					5 Roush	31*	63*	17	83					
					7 Adair	83	9	53	7					
					7 Bray	78	22	57	33					
					11 Bruce	100	0	--	--					
					2 Halleck	70	9	90	3					
					10 Harvey	83	4	--	--					
					6 Roudebush	87	4	--	--					
					9 Wilson	100	0	--	--					

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics

	1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4	
6 Morrison	22	48	23	40	NEBRASKA	5 Scott	78	13	77	0	6 McMillan	78	4	97	3
5 Passman	65	26	93	3	3 Beermann	100	0	--	--	12 Taylor	78	22	100†	0†	
7 Thompson	26	26	20	37	2 Cunningham	74	26	67	33	11 Whitemer**	78	17	90	7	
3 Willis	48	35	83	7	4 Martin	74	4	--	--	10 Jonas	100	0	97	3	
MAINE					1 Weaver	74	4	63	3	NORTH DAKOTA					
1 Garland	74	13	--	--	NEVADA	5 Scott	78	13	77	0	2 Berry	87	0	97	3
3 McIntire	83	4	97	3	AL Baring**	9	70	13	77	1 Reifei	70	9	--	--	
2 Tupper	61	22	--	--	NEW HAMPSHIRE	12 Taylor	78	22	100†	0†	SOUTH DAKOTA				
MARYLAND					2 Bass	83	13	60	37	6 McMillan	78	4	97	3	
2 Brewster	13	78	27	67	1 Merrow	39	52	23	40	2 Riley	78	0	87	7	
4 Fallon	39	52	30	63	NEW JERSEY	11 Addonizio	0	100	7	93	1 Rivers	78	4	83	3
7 Friedel	4	96	13	83	14 Daniels	0	83	3	97	OHIO					
3 Garmatz	9	83	7	90	13 Gallagher	0	87	0	93	9 Ashley	9	78	13	50	
1 Johnson**	26	61	47	53	8 Joelson	4	91	--	--	11 Cook	17	57	17	73	
5 Lankford	17	70	27	60	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	20 Feighan	30	70	20	80	
6 Matibas	52	48	--	--	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	18 Hays	17	65	7	87	
MASSACHUSETTS					10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	19 Kirwan	13	83	17	70	
2 Boland	13	87	20	70	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	10 Moeller	30	65	23	70	
13 Burke	9	91	7	93	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	21 Vonik	9	71	9	93	
4 Donohue	9	91	3	83	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	17 Asbrook	100	0	--	--	
7 Lane	13	87	20	77	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	14 Ayres	70	22	7	93	
8 Macdonald	17	65	10	70	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	8 Betts	100	0	100	0	
12 McCormack	9	87	20	77	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	22 Bolton	83	17	93	7	
11 O'Neill	9	78	3	87	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	16 Bow	91	4	93	0	
3 Philbin	13	87	3	83	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	7 Brown	96	0	93	3	
6 Bates	61	26	90	10	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	2 Clancy	91	4	--	--	
1 Conte	39	57	33	67	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	12 Devine	87	0	90	7	
10 Curtis	74	22	67	23	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	6 Harsba	74	13	--	--	
9 Keibl	65	35	83	13	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	5 Latta	96	4	97	3	
14 Martin	48	26	33	27	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	4 McCulloch	96	4	97	3	
5 Morse	52	48	--	--	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	23 Minshall	87	9	93	3	
MICHIGAN					10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	15 Moorehead	83	9	--	--	
7 O'Hara	13	87	0	100	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	13 Mosher	78	17	--	--	
12 Bennett**	52	35	33	63	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	3 Schenck	83	9	97	3	
18 Broomfield	70	22	67	33	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	1 Scherer	87	0	90	10	
10 Cederberg	65	9	97	0	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	OKLAHOMA					
6 Chamberlain	87	9	50	47	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	3 Albert	22	78	33	60	
5 Ford	83	4	90	10	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	2 Edmondson	13	78	20	67	
9 Grifin	78	9	70	30	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	5 Jarman	70	30	60	40	
8 Harvey	83	4	--	--	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	4 Steed	43	48	33	40	
4 Hoffman**	91	0	90	3	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	6 Wickersham	22	78	--	--	
3 Johansen	96	0	97	3	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	1 Belcher	100	0	97	0	
11 Knox**	91	0	73	20	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	OREGON					
2 Meader	96	0	93	0	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	3 Green**	0	83	3	93	
Detroit - Wayne County					10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	2 Ulliman	17	83	3	97	
13 Diggs	4	91	0	77	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	4 Durso	65	17	--	--	
15 Dingell	0	96	3	93	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	1 Norblad	70	22	90	7	
17 Griffiths	13	78	10	77	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	PENNSYLVANIA					
16 Lesinski	22	65	7	87	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	25 Clark	13	87	10	90	
1 Machrowicz	5*	90*	10	90	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	21 Dent	17	52	3	93	
14 Rabaut**	0	30	10	70	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	11 Flood	22	70	20	80	
MINNESOTA					10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	30 Holland**	9	78	7	93	
8 Blatnik	13	74	7	83	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	28 Moorhead	4	87	10	90	
4 Karth	4	78	0	100	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	26 Morgan	13	83	0	93	
6 Marshall	35	65	23	43	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	14 Rhodes	13	83	0	93	
7 Andersen**	74	26	83	17	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	15 Walter**	26	57	20	40	
5 Judd	70	17	57	33	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	29 Corbett	52	48	23	70	
9 Langen	100	0	97	3	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	8 Curtin	74	26	40	53	
3 MacGregor	65	22	--	--	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	9 Dague	74	4	60	37	
2 Nelsen	83	4	97	0	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	12 Fenton**	78	17	47	53	
1 Quie	78	13	77	23	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	27 Fulton	43	57	27	73	
MISSISSIPPI					10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	23 Gavin	78	17	57	30	
1 Abernethy	74	9	97	3	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	19 Goodling	87	13	--	--	
6 Colmer	78	0	93	7	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	24 Kearns	61	30	47	53	
3 Smith	48	39	77	23	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	7 Milliken**	43	22	63	37	
2 Whitten	96	4	87	13	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	16 Kunkel	71*	29*	--	--	
4 Williams	70	0	90	0	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	22 Saylor**	57	39	13	70	
5 Winstead	87	0	93	0	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	17 Schneebeli	78	22	75	25†	
MISSOURI					10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	13 Gilbert	65	35	--	--	
5 Bolling	13	78	3	97	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	14 Rooney	13	74	10	53	
9 Cannon	48	39	50	13	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	20 Ryan	4	96	--	--	
6 Hull	74	22	57	40	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	18 Santangelo	4	57	3	87	
8 Ichord	35	61	--	--	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	21 Zelenko	4	74	3	77	
10 Jones	61	9	67	27	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	25 Fino	22	57	13	73	
1 Karsten	4	96	3	97	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	17 Halpern	13	70	17	77	
11 Moulder	22	39	27	60	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	17 Lindsay	39	61	23	77	
4 Randall	26	74	3	93	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	15 Ray	100	0	87	13	
3 Sullivan	4	83	3	97	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	10 Henderson	78	17	--	--	
2 Curtis	78	9	50	47	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	8 Kitchin	100	0	90	3	
7 Hall	43	0	--	--	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	7 Lennon	83	17	--	--	
MONTANA					10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	7 Lennon	87	4	93	3	
1 Olsen	0	100	--	--	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90	5 Hemphill	48	52	90	10	
2 Battin**	70	9	--	--	10 Rodino	0	87	7	90						

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics

EXTENT OF NORTH-SOUTH DEMOCRATIC SPLIT ANALYZED

How deep is the division within the Democratic party? On what issues do Northern and Southern Democrats disagree?

In an effort to answer those questions, Congressional Quarterly since 1957 has analyzed the roll-call votes on which Southern Democrats and Northern Democrats took opposing stands. This study, the fifth in the series, covers the 1961 session of the 87th Congress. (For 1960 study, see 1960 Almanac p. 126)

Number of Splits

The majority of voting Southern Democrats and the majority of voting Northern Democrats took opposing stands on 106, or 33 percent, of the 1961 session's 320 roll calls.

This was lower than in 1960, when a North-South split occurred on 40 percent of the votes, the highest percentage in the five years studied. (However, the large number of Senate votes on civil rights and House votes on area redevelopment legislation tended to increase the percentage of North-South Democratic split votes in 1960.) Northern and Southern Democrats split on 27 percent of the 1959 roll calls, 29 percent of the 1958 roll calls and 31 percent of the 1957 roll calls.

For all of its studies, Congressional Quarterly counts 13 states as Southern -- Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia. The other 37 states are grouped as Northern.

In 1961, the Southern states had 23 Democratic Senators and 110 Democratic Representatives; the Northern states had 41 Democratic Senators and 152 Democratic Representatives.

To determine the number of roll calls on which there were North-South splits in the Democratic party, CQ checked all 1961 roll-call votes to see when the majority of voting Southern Democrats opposed the stand taken by the majority of voting Northern Democrats. Roll calls on which either Northern or Southern Democrats divided evenly were not counted as "splits."

Following are the 1961 results:

	Total Roll Calls	North-South Democratic Splits	Percentage of Splits
1961			
Both Chambers	320	106	33%
Senate	204	80	39
House	116	26	22

The roll calls on which the Democrats split, and the breakdown of votes on each, are listed on page 1810.

The table below shows how the number and percentage of splits in both chambers in 1961 compare with the previous four years.

Year	Total Roll Calls	North-South Democratic Splits	Percentage of Splits
1961	320	106	33%
1960	300	119	40
1959	302	83	27
1958	293	84	29
1957	207	64	31

Of the 106 roll calls in 1961 on which the North-South Democratic split occurred, the Southern majority was on the winning side 50 times -- 33 in the Senate and 17 in the House. All but two of the Senate and all but one of the House victories were largely won because of a "coalition" of a majority of the Southern Democrats and a majority of Republicans against a majority of Northern Democrats. (A "conservative coalition" occurred on 88 of the 106 votes on which there was a Democratic split. See p. 1796)

The remaining three victories -- two in the Senate and one in the House -- resulted from splits in the Republican and Northern Democratic votes in which the minorities were sufficiently large to form a winning margin when combined with the vote of the Southern Democrats. (See Senate RC 163, 192; House RC 35) In all three instances, the Democrats voting for the Southern position formed the majority of the voting Democrats.

As for the Southern wins that were largely victories of the "conservative coalition," 26 of the 31 Senate coalition victories would not have occurred without the help of some Northern Democrats. On exactly half of these 26 votes, the majority of the Southern Democrats voting as part of the coalition and the minority of Northern Democrats who joined them to help give the victory formed a majority of the total number of voting Democrats.

By contrast, only two of the coalition's House victories were won with the help of Northerners. On these, the majority of Democrats voted against deletion of a clause in the Defense Appropriations bill to give purchasing preference to depressed areas, and against a District of Columbia revenue bill.

The reason the Senate coalition victories are so much dependent on help from a Northern Democratic minority is that at its full theoretical strength the Senate conservative coalition has only 59 of 100 Senate votes. In the House, on the other hand, the coalition's full strength could reach 285, or 65 percent of the 437 House votes.

More important than the number of roll calls on which Northern and Southern Democrats differed are the issues that divided them. In 1961, as in the previous four years, splits showed differences between the two groups on many issues in addition to the consistently split-producing civil rights questions.

Issues that Divide Democrats

Civil Rights questions caused 14 North-South splits between Democrats, even though no civil rights bill per se was considered in 1961. The splits occurred over changing the Senate rules, civil rights amendments to aid programs, and the Civil Rights Commission. (Senate roll calls 1, 38, 52, 104, 114, 160-5, 193-4; House roll call 94)

Foreign Aid figured in 17 North-South splits. The majority of Southern Democrats in the Senate opposed Treasury borrowing ("backdoor spending") and supported annual appropriations instead (the equivalent test in the House was not put to a roll-call vote), and Southern Democrats in both chambers supported cuts in the program and split with their Northern colleagues on administrative questions. (Senate RC 130-1, 133-5, 137-8, 141-3, 146, 148, 151, 167, 190; House RC 88, 116)

Depressed Areas legislation caused three North-South Democratic splits. Southerners in both chambers opposed Treasury borrowing instead of annual appropriations and Senate Southerners voted to cut funds for public facilities. (Senate RC 5, 9; House RC 22)

Temporary Unemployment Compensation divided Northern and Southern Democrats in the Senate three times as Southerners supported moves to put each state on its own rather than have an all-state "pooling" principle, to reduce benefits in accordance with a person's other pension benefits, and to require repayment by employers in 1961-2 instead of 1962-3. (Senate RC 14-16)

Minimum Wage divided the Democrats on eight roll calls as Southerners in both chambers supported cuts in new workers to be covered. (Senate RC 25-6, 28-30; House RC 14, 15, 23)

School Aid caused splits on five roll calls. A majority of Southern Democrats in both chambers voted against any bill at all, and Senate Southerners voted against expanding the use of school aid to the operation of schools and supported an alternative program of school aid from taxes returned to the states. A Senate split was also produced by Southern support of a two-year extension of impacted areas and NDEA aid. (Senate RC 39, 45, 54, 185; House RC 84)

Housing programs caused 12 North-South splits in the Senate as Southerners broke with Northern Democrats and voted against the new moderate-income housing program and for several other cuts in the omnibus bill. (Senate RC 59, 62, 64-72, 74)

Mexican Farm Labor nine times caused a split between Northern and Southern Democrats, with Southerners supporting moves to extend the existing program without incorporating safeguards for domestic workers. (Senate RC 181-3, 199-202; House RC 26, 100)

Farm questions in general caused only one North-South split between Democrats. House Southerners opposed a move to cut funds for conservation program payments. (House RC 35)

Election Reform legislation, which was not considered in the House, caused two Senate North-South splits. Southerners resisted increased federal supervision of campaign expenditures. (Senate RC 191-2)

House Rules Committee reorganization to give Administration supporters control split House Democrats, with Southerners opposing the change. (House RC 3)

Reorganization plans submitted by the President caused North-South splits in the House on the question of two agencies, the Federal Communications Commission and the National Labor Relations Board. (House RC 40, 59)

Public Power on three occasions split Northerners and Southerners in the House, with Southerners opposing an Atomic Energy Commission plan to build an electricity generator at the Hanford, Wash., plutonium-producing plant. (House RC 69, 70, 97)

Individual Stands

The score charts on the following pages show how often each Senator and Representative, from the North as well as the South, voted with and against the Southern position on the party-splitting issues. (Only "yeas" and "nays" were counted; pairs and announced stands were not.)

Senate

Most "Southern" Southerners -- The Southern Democratic Senators who voted most frequently with the majority of Southerners on the 80 party-splitting issues in 1961 were: John Stennis (Miss.) and Strom Thurmond (S.C.) 79; Richard B. Russell (Ga.) 76; Herman Talmadge (Ga.) and B. Everett Jordan (N.C.) 75; Spessard L. Holland (Fla.) and Sam J. Ervin Jr. (N.C.) 74.

Least "Southern" Southerners -- The Southern Democratic Senators who voted most frequently against the majority of Southerners on the 80 party-splitting issues in 1961 were: Estes Kefauver (Tenn.) 61; A.S. Mike Monroney (Okla.) 50; Albert Gore (Tenn.) 49; Ralph W. Yarborough (Texas) 45; John J. Sparkman (Ala.) 44; Lister Hill (Ala.) 41.

Most "Southern" Northerners -- The Northern Democratic Senators who voted most frequently with the majority of Southerners were: Frank J. Lausche (Ohio) 43; Alan Bible (Nev.) 36; Howard W. Cannon (Nev.) 28; Carl Hayden (Ariz.) 22; Frank Church (Idaho) 19; Proxmire (Wis.) 16; Byrd (W.Va.) 16; Gruening (Alaska) 16; McGee (Wyo.) 15; Hickey (Wyo.) 15; Mansfield (Mont.) 15.

House

Most "Southern" Southerners -- The Southern Democratic Representatives who voted most frequently with the majority of Southerners on the 26 party-splitting issues in 1961 were: Robert T. Ashmore (S.C.) 26; and all with 25 -- Amistead I. Selden Jr. (Ala.), E.C. Gathings (Ark.), James A. Haley (Fla.), E.L. Forrester (Ga.), Jamie L. Whitten (Miss.), Hugh Alexander (N.C.), A. Paul Kitchin (N.C.), Watkins M. Abbott (Va.) and William M. Tuck (Va.).

Most "Northern" Southerners -- The Southern Representatives who voted most frequently against the majority of Southerners on the 26 party-splitting issues in 1961 were: Carl Albert, Ed Edmondson and Victor Wickersham (Okla.) 20; James A. Burke (Ky.), Wright Patman (Texas) and Albert Thomas (Texas) 19; Carl Elliott (Ala.), Carl D. Perkins and Ross Bass (Tenn.) 18.

Most "Southern" Northerners -- The Northern Representatives who voted most frequently with the majority of Southerners were: W.R. Hull Jr. (Mo.) 18; Paul C. Jones (Mo.) 15; Clarence Cannon (Mo.) 12; Thomas G. Morris (N.M.) and Fred Marshall (Minn.) 10; Richard H. Ichord (Mo.) 9 and George H. Fallon (Md.) 9.

Stands of Individual Democrats

The charts below and on the following page show how often individual Democrats voted "with" and "against" the Southern position on party-splitting issues. The first two columns are based on the 80 Senate roll calls and the 26 House roll calls on which the majority of voting Southern Democrats opposed the stand taken by the majority of voting Northern Democrats in 1961. The last two columns show the votes of Southern Democrats on 148 similar Senate roll calls and 54 similar House roll calls in the 86th Congress. CQ did not make a study of Northern Democrats' positions on these votes in the 86th Congress.

● COLUMN 1 gives the number of roll calls on which the Member voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the majority of voting Southern Democrats in 1961.

● COLUMN 2 gives the number of roll calls on which the Member voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the majority of voting Southern Democrats in 1961.

● COLUMN 3 gives the number of roll calls on which the Member voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the majority of voting Southern Democrats in the 86th Congress.

● COLUMN 4 gives the number of roll calls on which the Member voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the majority of voting Southern Democrats in the 86th Congress.

Failure to vote kept the figure for most Senators and Representatives below the maximum possible.

Southern Democratic Senators' Scores

	1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4
ALABAMA					GEORGIA					NORTH CAROLINA					TENNESSEE				
Hill	38	41	75	51	Russell	76	0	121	5	Ervin	74	3	130	9	Gore	20	49	30	104
Sparkman	33	44	66	46	Talmadge	75	4	126	6	Jordan	75	2	117	8	Kefauver	13	61	21	84
ARKANSAS					LOUISIANA					OKLAHOMA					TEXAS				
Fulbright	41	29	76	47	Ellender	64	10	117	13	Kerr	35	33	70	52	Yarborough	16	45	31	104
McClellan	71	1	130	5	Long	45	29	91	46	Monroney	29	50	29	109					
FLORIDA					MISSISSIPPI					SOUTH CAROLINA					VIRGINIA				
Holland	74	6	116	25	Eastland	71	1	116	4	Johnston	55	21	103	37	Byrd	69	2	130	1
Smathers	65	12	78	27	Stennis	79	1	138	3	Thurmond	79	1	133	6	Robertson	63	3	131	3

Southern Democratic Representatives' Scores

ALABAMA	9 Landrum	13	3	44	1	4 Cooley	12	6	34	10	TEXAS								
3 Andrews	21	5	40	3	2 Pilcher	9	3	42	3	2 Fountain	24	2	48	5	3 Beckworth	13	13	26	28
1 Boykin	18	2	28	7	10 Stephens	22	1	--	--	3 Henderson	21	4	--	--	2 Brooks	10	16	24	30
7 Elliott	8	18	23	25	6 Vinson	5	8	33	11	8 Kitchin	25	1	49	1	17 Burleson	20	6	36	4
2 Grant	19	3	35	3	KENTUCKY					6 Kornegay	22	4	--	--	22 Casey	19	7	34	18
9 Huddleston	17	6	42	12	3 Burke	4	19	11	42	7 Lennon	22	2	51	1	7 Dowdy	24	0	41	2
8 Jones	9	17	27	24	4 Chelf	14	11	23	16	5 Scott	20	4	41	1	21 Fisher	24	2	50	2
5 Rains	7	7	28	15	2 Notcher	11	15	20	34	12 Taylor	21	5	41	01	13 Ikard	15	7	25	27
4 Roberts	5	9	29	10	7 Perkins	8	18	11	40	11 Whitener	21	4	50	3	20 Kilday	7*	15*	23	31
6 Selden	25	1	46	8	5 Spence	10	16	19	28					15 Kilgore	14	8	33	21	
ARKANSAS					1 Stubblefield	9	15	19	33					19 Mahon	16	9	33	21	
5 Alford	21	1	45	2	6 Watts	12	11	20	30	3 Albert	5	20	15	35	1 Patman	6	19	33	21
1 Gathings	25	1	50	4	LOUISIANA					2 Edmondson	4	20	15	32	11 Poage	18	5	41	8
4 Harris	18	6	46	5	2 Boggs	7	10	23	24	5 Jorman	17	9	25	28	18 Rogers	17	5	37	4
2 Mills	18	8	35	18	4 Brooks	11*	2*	45	4	4 Street	11	12	25	19	16 Rutherford	17	9	36	18
6 Norrell, C.	17*	1*	--	--	1 Hebert	14	1	24	8	6 Wickersham	6	20	--	--	6 Teague	18	5	32	7
3 Trimble	9	16	28	25	8 McSween	17	1	42	4	SOUTH CAROLINA					8 Thomas	5	19	25	26
FLORIDA					6 Morrison	7	11	18	14	4 Ashmore	26	0	52	1	9 Thompson	10	16	32	21
2 Bennett	10	16	31	23	5 Passman	17	6	46	6	3 Dorn	22	1	52	1	10 Thornberry	8	17	21	33
4 Foscall	11	12	22	31	7 Thompson	8	6	16	12	5 Hemphill	14	12	50	4	12 Wright	10	9	25	26
7 Holey	25	1	52	2	3 Willis	13	8	39	3	6 McMillan	21	1	49	2	14 Young	10	8	36	5
5 Herlong	21	1	32	9	MISSISSIPPI					2 Riley	20	0	46	4	VIRGINIA				
8 Matthews	24	2	37	17	1 Abernethy	20	2	53	1	1 Rivers	20	1	46	3	4 Abbott	25	1	53	1
6 Rogers	21	5	39	15	6 Colmer	20	0	51	2	TENNESSEE					1 Downing	23	1	47	7
3 Sikes	20	3	37	14	3 Smith	14	9	36	18	9 Davis	9	10	23	18	3 Gary	24	2	44	10
GEORGIA					2 Whitten	25	1	50	4	8 Everett	15	11	48	6	2 Hardy	22	2	42	10
8 Blitch	19	1	38	2	4 Williams	19	0	50	0	4 Ewings	11	7	26	21	7 Harrison	15	1	47	3
5 Davis, J. C.	22	0	49	1	5 Winstead	22	0	51	0	3 Frazier	14	8	28	20	9 Jennings	11	13	38	16
7 Davis,J. W.	21	4	--	--	NORTH CAROLINA					5 Loser	10	11	36	14	8 Smith	23	1	49	3
4 Flynt	19	2	53	0	9 Alexander	25	1	36	3	7 Murray	20	4	47	2	5 Tuck	25	1	49	0
3 Forrester	25	1	48	3	1 Bonner	15	9	31	5										
1 Hogan	23	2	--	--															

Northern Democratic Senators' Scores

	1	2		1	2		1	2		1	2
ALASKA			INDIANA			NEVADA			RHODE ISLAND		
Bartlett	8	63	Harken	8	56	Bible	36	43	Pastore	6	74
Gruening	16	40	MAINE			Cannon	28	47	Pell	5	75
ARIZONA			Muskie	5	65	NEW JERSEY			UTAH		
Hayden	22	44	Smith	0	70	Williams	4	75	Moss	10	57
CALIFORNIA			MICHIGAN			Anderson	12	36	WASHINGTON		
Engle	14	62	Hart	0	71	Chavez	1	8	Jackson	8	72
COLORADO			McNamara	2	75	Burdick	7	62	Magnuson	11	63
Carroll	3	73	MINNESOTA			NORTH DAKOTA			WEST VIRGINIA		
Dodd	11	56	Humphrey	1	73	Lausche	43	32	Byrd	16	64
HAWAII			McCarthy	6	56	Young	9	68	Randolph	5	71
Long	9	65	MISSOURI			OREGON			WISCONSIN		
IDAHO			Long	1	66	Morse	3	65	Proxmire	16	63
Church	19	54	Symington	4	69	Neuberger	1	57	WYOMING		
ILLINOIS			MONTANA			Pennsylvania	5	68	Hickey	15	52
Douglas	4	75	Mansfield	15	57	Clark			McGee	15	62
			Metcalf	8	61						

Northern Democratic Representatives' Scores

ALASKA		3 Murphy	3 23	9 Cannon	12 11	OHIO		
AL Rivers	4	21	6 O'Brien	3 23	6 Hull	18 7	9 Ashley	2 19
ARIZONA			2 O'Hara	3 23	8 Ichord	9 15	11 Cook	5 14
2 Udall, M.	2*	18*	11 Pucinski	3 23	10 Jones	15 2	20 Feighan	7 19
CALIFORNIA			8 Rostenkowski	2 21	1 Karsten	1 25	18 Hays	5 17
7 Cahan	1	24	9 Yates	2 24	11 Moulder	6 11	19 Kirwan	3 22
14 Hagen	5	21	INDIANA		4 Randall	7 19	10 Moeller	7 17
2 Johnson	2	23	3 Brademas	1 25	3 Sullivan	1 22	21 Vanik	2 24
11 McFall	5	21	8 Denton	7 19	MONTANA		OREGON	
1 Miller, C.	5	18	1 Madden	3 18	1 Olsen	1 25	3 Green	0 22
8 Miller, G. P.	3	21	5 Roush	5* 12*	AL Boring	2 19	2 Ullman	5 20
3 Moss	4	19	IOWA		NEW JERSEY		PENNSYLVANIA	
29 Sound	3	18	6 Coad	3 19	11 Addazio	0 26	25 Clark	3 23
5 Shelley	2	20	5 Smith	3 22	14 Daniels	0 21	21 Dent	4 15
27 Sheppard	3	13	KANSAS		13 Gallagher	0 23	11 Flood	6 18
12 Sisk	5	19	5 Breeding	7 17	8 Joelson	1 24	30 Holland	2 21
Los Angeles Co.			MARYLAND		10 Rodino	0 23	28 Moorhead	1 23
22 Corman	3	21	2 Brewster	3 21	4 Thompson	0 25	26 Morgan	5 20
23 Doyle	5	21	4 Fallon	9 14	NEW MEXICO		14 Rhodes	3 22
19 Hollifield	2	19	7 Friedel	1 25	AL Montoya	5 18	15 Walter	6 15
17 King	1	25	3 Garmatz	2 21	AL Morris	10 16	Philadelphia City	
26 Roosevelt	2	20	1 Johnson	7 16	41 Dulski	7 19	1 Barrett	1 23
COLORADO			5 Lankford	5 18	30 O'Brien	3 15	3 Byrne	1 25
4 Aspinall	6	16	MASSACHUSETTS		1 Pike	8 18	2 Granahan	2 24
1 Rogers	2	23	2 Boland	3 23	32 Stratton	4 22	5 Green	0 24
CONNECTICUT			13 Burke	2 24	NEW YORK CITY		4 Nix	1 25
1 Daddario	4	22	4 Donohue	2 24	5 Addabbo	1 25	6 Toll	1 25
3 Giaimo	5	21	7 Lane	4 22	8 Anfuso	2 19	RHODE ISLAND	
AL Kowalski	4	22	8 Macdonald	4 18	24 Buckley	1 8	2 Fogarty	1 20
5 Monagan	8	18	12 McCormack	2 22	12 Carey	0 19	1 St. Germain	2 22
DELAWARE			11 O'Neil	2 20	11 Cellier	2 17	2 King	5 20
AL McDowell	0	26	3 Philbin	3 23	7 Delaney	2 22	1 Peterson	7 17
HAWAII			MICHIGAN		19 Fortbane	1 22	WASHINGTON	
AL Inouye	2	21	7 O'Hara	4 21	23 Gilbert	0 24	3 Hansen	2 22
IDAHO			Detroit - Wayne County		22 Healey	1 22	7 Magnuson	8 17
2 Harding	4	22	13 Diggs	1 23	6 Holtzman	0 22	WEST VIRGINIA	
1 Post	5	19	15 Dingell	0 25	10 Kelly	3 21	3 Bailey	8 18
ILLINOIS			17 Griffiths	3 21	9 Keogh	2 18	4 Hechler	2 24
25 Gray	5	18	16 Lesinski	5 17	13 Multer	1 20	5 Kee	7 17
21 Mack	6	20	1 Machrowicz	1* 20*	16 Powell	1 14	6 Slack	7 14
24 Price	2	24	14 Rabut	1 7	14 Rooney	4 19	2 Steppes	8 17
23 Shipley	7	19	MINNESOTA		20 Ryan	1 25	9 Johnson	3 22
Chicago Cook County			8 Blatnik	4 19	18 Santangelo	2 14	2 Kastenmeier	3 22
1 Dawson	3	17	4 Korth	2 20	21 Zelenko	1 20	5 Reuss	2 19
12 Finnegan	2	23	5 Marshall	10 16			4 Zablocki	5 19
5 Kluczynski	2	22	MISSOURI					
7 Libonati	6	14	5 Bolling	3 21				

Roll Calls on Which Northern, Southern Democrats Split

Following is a partial list of the 106 Senate and House roll calls in 1961 on which the majority of voting Southern Democrats opposed the stand taken by the majority of voting Northern Democrats. This list contains 18 of the 106 votes in this category. The other 88 votes fitting the definition are listed in the Conservative Coalition analysis on page 1796.

In this breakdown, Southern Democrats are Members from Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia; Northern Democrats come from the other 37 states.

The roll calls are listed in their chronological order by Congressional Quarterly roll call (RC) number.

For each roll call, the total vote is broken down into three groups: Southern Democrats (SD), Northern Democrats (ND), and Republicans (R).

Senate Roll Calls

RC 38 -- S 1021. School Assistance Act of 1961, providing \$2.5 billion in grants for public school construction and teachers' salaries. Thurmond (D S.C.) amendment to prohibit the withholding of funds because of racial segregation in the schools. Rejected 25-70 (SD 19-5; ND 0-39; R 6-26); May 17, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment.

RC 39 -- S 1021. Blakley (D Texas) amendment, as modified by Miller (R Iowa) amendment, to return to each state for education purposes two percent of the federal taxes on personal income collected in the state. Rejected 30-64 (SD 13-9; ND 1-38; R 16-17), May 17, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

RC 52 -- S 1021. Morse (D Ore.) motion to table (reject) Talmadge (D Ga.) amendment to bar the withholding of funds from any state education agency "which has complied with the provisions of this Act." Tabling motion agreed to 61-30 (SD 1-21; ND 34-4; R 26-5), May 24, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion.

RC 77 -- HR 6713. Change the method of financing the federal-aid highway program and the authorization schedule for the National Interstate and Defense Highway program for fiscal years 1963-71. Case (R S.D.) amendment to limit to one year the pending Neuberger (D Ore.)-Cooper (R Ky.) amendment that would extend for two years the federal bonus for states that develop plans to limit billboards on interstate highways. Rejected 38-55 (SD 18-5; ND 7-30; R 13-20), June 15, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

RC 95 -- S 1154. Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. Keating (R N.Y.) amendment extending the Alien Orphan Act for two years, through June 30, 1963. Agreed to 69-12 (SD 4-12; ND 34-0; R 31-0), July 12, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment.

RC 104 -- Nomination of Spottswood Robinson III, dean of Howard University Law School, to the Civil Rights Commission. Nomination confirmed 73-17 (SD 5-16; ND 36-0; R 32-1), July 27, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

RC 133 -- S 1983. Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Ellender (D La.) amendment to reduce the military assistance authorization for fiscal 1962 and fiscal 1963 from \$1.8 billion to \$1.3 billion. Rejected 37-58 (SD 16-7; ND 10-30; R 11-21), Aug. 15, 1961. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

RC 143 -- S 1983. Bush (R Conn.) substitute (for a more strongly worded amendment) barring aid to any country unless the

President determined that it was not dominated or controlled by international Communism. Agreed to 61-34 (SD 5-17; ND 33-6; R 23-11), Aug. 17, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

RC 151 -- S 1983. Passage of the bill. Passed 66-24 (SD 9-12; ND 37-1; R 20-11), Aug. 18, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

RC 160 -- HR 7371. State-Justice-Judiciary funds for fiscal 1962. Mansfield (D Mont.) motion to suspend rules in order to permit consideration of amendment extending life of Civil Rights Commission. A two-thirds vote was required to suspend the rules. Rules suspended 72-21 (SD 4-18; ND 38-1; R 30-2), Aug. 30, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

RC 163 -- HR 7371. Mansfield (D Mont.) motion to table (kill) Javits (R N.Y.) amendment authorizing Attorney General to bring civil suits for injunctions to prevent individuals from being deprived of any civil right. Tabling motion agreed to 47-42 (SD 22-0; ND 11-27; R 14-15), Aug. 30, 1961. The President did not take a position on the motion.

RC 165 -- HR 7371. Mansfield (D Mont.)-Dirksen (R Ill.) amendment extending life of Civil Rights Commission for two years, until Nov. 9, 1963. Agreed to 70-19 (SD 4-18; ND 37-4; R 29-1), Aug. 30, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

RC 167 -- S 1983. Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Conference report, authorizing \$4,253,500,000 in fiscal 1962 for foreign aid and \$1.5 billion in each of the succeeding four fiscal years for development loans. Agreed to 69-24 (SD 10-13; ND 38-1; R 21-10), Aug. 31, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

RC 190 -- HR 9033. Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act for fiscal 1962. Passage of the bill. Passed 62-17 (SD 9-10; ND 30-1; R 23-6), Sept. 15, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

RC 192 -- S 2426. Federal Elections Act of 1961. Keating (R N.Y.) amendment to make the bill apply to primaries, caucuses and conventions. Rejected 30-44 SD 2-18; ND 16-14; R 12-12), Sept. 15, 1961. The President did not take a position on the amendment.

House Roll Calls

RC 35 -- HR 7444. Agriculture Department appropriations for fiscal 1962. Reuss (D Wis.) amendment to reduce the \$250 million authorization for Agricultural Conservation Program payments in calendar 1962 to \$150 million, as proposed by the President. Rejected 184-196 (SD 7-84; ND 73-64; R 104-48), June 6, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

RC 73 -- HR 6302. Transfer ownership and administration of Freedmen's Hospital, D.C., from the Federal Government to Howard University and authorize appropriations for construction of a teaching hospital to replace the old Freedmen's Hospital plant. Passed 321-61 (SD 39-55; ND 130-0; R 152-6), Aug. 9, 1961. The President did not take a position on the bill.

RC 94 -- HR 7371. State-Justice-Judiciary funds for fiscal 1962. Rooney (D N.Y.) motion to agree to a Senate amendment extending the Civil Rights Commission for two years. Agreed to 300-106 (SD 19-81; ND 142-1; R 139-24), Sept. 13, 1961. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

NEW SENIOR CITIZENS' GROUP WILL PUSH HEALTH CARE ISSUE

A new national organization of the elderly has been formed to press for passage of the King-Anderson bill (HR 422, S 909), which would provide medical care for the aged through the Social Security mechanism.

The organization, called National Council of Senior Citizens for Health Care Through Social Security, came into being late in July when ex-Rep. Aime J. Forand (D.R.I. 1937-39, 1941-61) agreed to become national chairman. As a Member of Congress, Forand was a leading advocate and sponsor of the principle of health care through Social Security. He also headed Senior Citizens for Kennedy during the 1960 Presidential campaign.

Planning for the new organization got underway during the Jan. 9-12 White House Conference on Aging in Washington, D.C. At that time Forand, together with some of his former aides in Senior Citizens for Kennedy, met with leaders in the field of aging who had assembled for the White House Conference. From their discussions which took place at the Shoreham Hotel, there emerged an ad hoc committee to form a national senior citizens' council.

Forand subsequently sent a number of letters publicizing his plans and asking for contributions to leaders in the field of aging, particularly the heads of local senior citizens and golden age clubs all over the nation. Contacts and mailing lists developed by the Senior Citizens for Kennedy movement during the 1960 Presidential campaign were used.

Late in July Forand agreed to become chairman of the new organization, and it acquired a three-room office at 200 C Street, Southeast, in Washington. Two full-time paid employees were hired July 22, John Colao as director of organization and Laurine A. Pemberton as administrative assistant to Forand. A special Advisory Committee was established as a temporary governing board, drawn from among persons who had been active doing spadework for the new group since the White House Conference. Colao Sept. 6 told CQ the Advisory Committee would function as a governing board until a national constitutional convention was held -- possibly in April 1962 -- after initial organizing efforts had been completed.

Names and cities of the members of the Advisory Committee are given below.

Ernest J. Bohn, director of the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority; John Brophy, community services director of Industrial Union Division, AFL-CIO, retired, Washington; Dr. Arthur Carstens, Department of Industrial Relations, U.C.L.A., Los Angeles; Ramiro R. Casso, M.D., member of Academy of General Practice, McAllen, Texas; Dr. Wilma Donohue, Institute of Gerontology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; Benedict Duffy, M.D., Seton Hall School of Medicine, Jersey City, N.J.; Dr. James Graves, Commissioner of Mental Health and Detroit Receiving Hospital, Detroit; Rubin Morris Hanan, Alabama League of Aging Citizens, Montgomery, Ala.; Adolph Held, chairman of Council of Golden Ring Clubs, New York City; Dr. Robert Kleemeier, Washington Uni-

versity Psychology department, St. Louis; O.E. Midyett, Senior Citizens Organization, San Francisco; Daniel Mishell, M.D., Southern California Committee for Health Care for the Aged through Social Security, Los Angeles; Dr. Mary Mulvey, administrator of Division of Aging, Providence, R.I.; Lt. Lawrence Oxley, former special assistant to the Secretary of Labor, Washington; Hon. Margaret Schweinhaut, Maryland House of Delegates, Rock Creek, Md.; Rear Adm. Robert L. Swart, U.S.N., ret., Arlington, Va.; Mrs. William Wathen, Senior Citizens Organization, Kansas City, Mo. and George F. Willis, Senior Citizens Organization, Seattle, Wash.; Joseph Anderson, executive director of National Assn. of Social Workers; Judge Henry Balaban, vice mayor of Miami Beach, Fla.; Prof. Ernest Burgess, gerontologist, University of Chicago; Jack Gordon, president of Washington Federal Savings & Loan Assn., Miami Beach; Dorothy Height, president of National Council of Negro Women; Ray Henry, editor of "50 Plus" magazine; Mrs. Theodore Wedel, former vice president of National Council of Churches; Dr. Harry Levine, psychologist, New York; Charles Odell, director of Older and Retired Workers, United Auto Workers (AFL-CIO); Nathan Cowan, chairman of Committee on Retired Workers, United Steelworkers (AFL-CIO); Albert Tate Sr., retired businessman, Ville Platte, La.; Zalmen Lichtenstein, director of the Council of the Golden Ring; Judge Fred Nichol, chairman of South Dakota Governor's Committee on Aging; and Anthony Salamone, chairman of advisory council of Golden Age and Senior Citizens Council of the U.S.A.

Purposes and Potentials

Forand Aug. 25-Oct. 25 sent letters to 6,000 persons throughout the nation, most of them the heads of senior citizens', Golden Rings and similar groups, announcing formation of the National Council and asking them to affiliate with the group. He explained as follows the purpose of the organization:

- Organization was to be non-profit and non-partisan.
- Primary purpose was "to weld senior citizens' organizations and millions of interested individuals from all over the country into one strong and effective voice in Washington."
- "Immediate goal is to secure legislation providing health care for the aged through Social Security."
- Long-range hope "is that this new organization will eventually provide the framework for a non-partisan progressive council representing the views of older persons on major issues confronting the nation."

Forand's letter said the Council already had plans to publish an "up-to-date Washington newsletter" and various special legislative bulletins, to use its Washington office as an informational clearinghouse, to gather and pool information "to help senior citizens present their views in a more effective manner," to furnish educational materials in localities (radio tapes, films, film

charts) as an "aid in building community support and understanding," and to assist in organizing local and state councils of senior citizens.

Colao, the director of organization, Sept. 6 told CQ the new council had a potential membership in the millions, since there were 16,559,580 elderly persons (65 or over) according to the 1960 U.S. census. Colao said there were about 7,000 senior citizens' and golden-age clubs in the U.S., plus numerous labor-sponsored organizations for retired union members. He estimated that, all together, these groups had a membership close to 4 million.

Dr. Blue Carstenson was appointed Oct. 18 as the Council's executive director. He said Oct. 25 that responses had been received to Forand's letter committing to membership groups with over 300,000 members.

Colao told CQ the Council had two types of membership: affiliation by local organizations and affiliation by individuals whose local organizations did not join or who lived in areas where no local senior citizens' groups existed.

Until the initial affiliation and membership drive was over, Colao said, there were no dues; when a national constitutional convention was held, it would establish a permanent governing body and fix dues or some other method of supporting the organization's activities.

In the meanwhile, activities were being carried out with individual contributions received from persons and groups with whom Forand has been corresponding in recent months in plans to establish the National Council.

Colao said contributions had been received from various senior citizens' clubs, from physicians and others in the fields of medicine, gerontology and welfare. He said there was no one "big giver" and no extensive financial support from union sources. He also said that massive labor union units for the elderly were not among the groups affiliated with the new National Council as yet, although it was hoped they, like other large organizations for the elderly, would come in.

Colao said the Advisory Committee met Sept. 13 and Oct. 3 to discuss further organizational efforts and the outlines of a possible legislative campaign in favor of the King-Anderson medical-aid-to-the-aged bill. He said a "tremendous amount" of educational work on the legislative issue was planned among members and affiliates "between now and the next session of Congress." This work would be done largely through mailings and personal contact between National Council leaders and heads of groups for the elderly in most areas of the country. The objective of this activity, he said, was to "explain the issue, explain it again and again, so people will understand the difference between the King-Anderson bill and the Kerr-Mills approach, and will realize how pitiful the latter is in its results."

Colao said it had not been decided yet by the Advisory Committee whether, in addition to getting up a campaign of grass-roots pressure for the King-Anderson (Social Security) approach, the National Council would also undertake lobbying in the nation's capital. Colao said the educational work on the medical care issue would be planned to produce the most effect early in 1961, when the bill was expected to be considered by Congress.

President Kennedy Aug. 31, in a letter to Sen. Pat McNamara (D Mich.), a leading backer of the King-Anderson bill, said, "I intend to recommend that this legislation be given the highest priority at the next session of Congress." (Weekly Report p. 1557, 1391)

Aged Population by State

The Census Bureau March 14 released figures showing the number of aged persons (65 or older) by state in 1960. These figures are shown below along with the percents (for various years) that the aged represented in the total population of each state.

	1960	1940	1920
ALABAMA	261,147	8.0%	4.8%
ALASKA	5,386	2.4	---
ARIZONA	90,225	6.9	4.7
ARKANSAS	194,372	10.9	5.5
CALIFORNIA	1,376,204	8.8	8.0
COLORADO	158,160	9.0	7.7
CONNECTICUT	242,615	9.6	7.6
DELAWARE	35,745	8.0	7.7
D. OF C.	69,143	9.1	6.3
FLORIDA	553,129	11.2	6.9
GEORGIA	290,661	7.4	5.1
HAWAII	29,162	4.6	---
IDAHO	58,258	8.7	6.0
ILLINOIS	974,923	9.7	7.2
INDIANA	445,519	9.6	8.4
IOWA	327,685	11.9	8.9
KANSAS	240,269	11.0	8.7
KENTUCKY	292,323	9.6	6.6
LOUISIANA	241,591	7.4	5.0
MAINE	106,544	11.0	9.5
MARYLAND	226,539	7.3	6.8
MASSACHUSETTS	571,609	11.1	8.5
MICHIGAN	638,184	8.2	6.3
MINNESOTA	354,351	10.4	7.7
MISSISSIPPI	190,029	8.7	5.3
MISSOURI	503,411	11.7	8.6
MONTANA	65,420	9.7	6.5
NEBRASKA	164,156	11.6	7.9
NEVADA	18,173	6.4	6.2
NEW HAMPSHIRE	67,705	11.2	9.9
NEW JERSEY	560,414	9.2	6.7
NEW MEXICO	51,270	5.4	4.4
NEW YORK	1,687,590	10.1	6.8
NORTH CAROLINA	312,167	6.9	4.5
NORTH DAKOTA	58,591	9.3	6.2
OHIO	897,124	9.2	7.9
OKLAHOMA	248,831	10.7	6.1
OREGON	183,653	10.4	8.5
PENNSYLVANIA	1,128,525	10.0	6.9
RHODE ISLAND	89,540	10.4	7.5
SOUTH CAROLINA	150,599	6.3	4.2
SOUTH DAKOTA	71,513	10.5	6.8
TENNESSEE	308,861	8.7	5.9
TEXAS	745,391	7.8	5.4
UTAH	59,957	6.7	5.5
VERMONT	43,741	11.2	9.6
VIRGINIA	288,970	7.3	5.8
WASHINGTON	279,045	9.8	8.3
WEST VIRGINIA	172,516	9.3	5.3
WISCONSIN	402,736	10.2	7.7
WYOMING	25,908	7.8	5.0
TOTAL	16,559,580	9.2%	6.9%
			4.7%

PRESIDENT KENNEDY FILLS 78 JUDGESHIP POSTS

A gamble by Congressional Democrats in the summer of 1960, which blocked creation of additional federal judgeships, paid off later in the fall when John F. Kennedy was elected President. The result was that President Kennedy, since his inauguration, has had 112 vacancies on the federal bench to fill -- 73 newly created by Congress and 39 created by death and resignation in 1961. He has named 75 Democrats and 1 Liberal, and resubmitted 3 Republican Eisenhower nominees, and the remaining 33 posts are waiting to be filled.

Although Presidents generally indicate their intentions to make federal judiciary appointments non-partisan, they traditionally go to those having the same political affiliation as the President. The nominees, who must receive Senate confirmation, currently must undergo careful screening by the Justice Department and the non-partisan American Bar Assn. Nevertheless, the same-party tradition remains strong. A judge is appointed for life at a salary of either \$22,500 or \$25,500. (See box, next page.)

Since 1955 both the President and Congress have agreed that additional federal circuit and district judges were needed in order to handle the increasing workload and backlog of cases on federal dockets. However, with Dwight D. Eisenhower in the Presidency, Democrats dominating Congress refused to pass the necessary legislation, believing that a large majority, if not all, of the new posts would go to Republicans. Then, in 1960 Attorney General William P. Rogers promised Democratic leaders that if Congress created the needed posts, Democrats would be named to half of them. A year or two earlier the offer probably would have been accepted, but with the Presidential election looming in the foreground and Democratic confidence running high, both the House and the Senate refused to bring to the floor bills already reported by the Judiciary Committees creating new posts. Instead, Democrats bet that they would win the elections, Presidential and Congressional, and thus leave the way open to all Democratic appointments when Congress created new judgeships early in 1961. (1960 Weekly Report p. 1374)

Having gambled and won, a Democratic Congress by May 4 had enacted legislation (PL 87-36) creating 10 new circuit court posts and 63 for the district court. These appointments, combined with the normal number of vacancies occurring on the federal bench due to death and retirement, as of Oct. 26 had brought the total number of appointments which Mr. Kennedy could fill to 112 -- a record for any single year. (Weekly Report p. 756)

Judgeship Appointments

Of the newly created posts to be filled, President Kennedy has appointed 10 circuit judges and 45 district judges. In addition, he has named 5 circuit judges and 16 district judges to fill posts vacated by deaths and retirement. All of these appointees -- 76 -- have been Democrats, with one exception -- Paul R. Hays, a New York Liberal.

In addition to the 76 appointees, three Republicans in 1961 were named federal district judges, but in each case they were appointed originally by President Eisenhower -- but not confirmed by the Senate before he left office -- and reappointed by President Kennedy. However, Mr. Kennedy could have, had he chosen to do so, withdrawn their names. The three Republicans: Andrew J. Caffrey, Massachusetts; C. Nils Tavares, Hawaii; and John Feikens, eastern Michigan. Caffrey and Tavares were confirmed before adjournment, but Feikens was not.

If an appointment is not confirmed before Congress adjourns, the post automatically becomes vacant. The nominee usually is kept in the post by a recess appointment and President Kennedy can be expected to give recess appointments to most of those nominees who were not confirmed before adjournment Sept. 27. (Feikens, however, is not expected to be renominated.)

Mr. Kennedy also can fill the other vacancies by recess appointments, although some of the appointees could not be paid. If the post was vacant at least 30 days before adjournment, but was not filled by the President, a recess appointee could not be paid until confirmed, at which time he would receive back pay. However, if the post became vacant during adjournment, or the last 30 days before, the nominee can be paid regardless of when he was appointed.

Kennedy and Democratic Judges

As a Presidential candidate, Mr. Kennedy Aug. 30, 1960 told the American Bar Assn. that he fully endorsed its principle of a bipartisan judiciary. He said: "I would hope that the paramount consideration in the appointment of a judge would not be his political party, but his qualifications for the office."

In an address given in New Orleans March 28, Bernard G. Segal, chairman of the ABA's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary, said there had been "as yet no concrete evidence" on the part of the Kennedy Administration of an "intention to make bipartisan appointments, nor any reiteration of President Kennedy's pledge of last August."

When queried about the intentions of the Administration during hearings on the judgeships bill March 1, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy did not commit himself to bipartisan judicial nominations, but did say that he believed the "best qualified individuals should be selected as judges." (Weekly Report p. 345)

Segel, appearing before the ABA convention in St. Louis, Aug. 9 said that two out of every three of the judgeship nominations had been made from "the best qualified judges and lawyers available," but at the same time he warned the Administration against appointing only Democrats.

He said: "If President Kennedy does not break new ground this time; if he does not introduce a real and convincing bipartisanship into appointments now...then the last best hope of achieving this goal in our generation will have been forefeited."

Although President Kennedy had as of Oct. 26 with

Judgeships Filled - 2

the four exceptions mentioned, appointed only Democrats to the federal bench, he had adhered closely to the standard rules set up by his predecessors for selecting judges. As of that date, the ABA ratings available for confirmed judges showed that 8 were exceptionally well qualified, 32 well qualified, 15 qualified and 2 not qualified.

An Administration spokesman told Congressional Quarterly that "several" GOP nominations currently were being processed and would probably be released in the near future.

ABA Role

The American Bar Assn., under an arrangement which began in 1945, works closely with the Justice Department and the Senate Judiciary Committee in passing on the qualification of prospective federal judges.

The arrangement works as follows. When a federal judgeship is created or vacated, the Justice Department compiles a list of prospective nominees who appear to be qualified for the position. While the Department's Federal Bureau of Investigation is conducting a background investigation of the prospects, the ABA's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary is investigating their professional qualifications. On the basis of these "informal reports," the actual nominee is selected and his name, along with the FBI's and ABA's formal reports, are sent by the President to the Senate Judiciary Committee. The ABA report rates the nominee either qualified, well qualified, exceptionally well qualified or not qualified. After hearings by the Senate Judiciary Committee, the nomination is sent to the full Senate for confirmation.

Under the original agreement, the ABA worked exclusively with the Senate Committee, submitting its evaluation of the nominee when informed by the Committee that hearings were going to be held. In 1952 the Justice Department as well asked for the ABA's evaluation of the candidate. In 1953, at the request of the Justice Department, the ABA stopped a practice of submitting the names of lawyers it considered qualified whenever a federal judicial vacancy occurred, and confined its reports to those under active consideration by the Department.

In his March 28 address at New Orleans, Bernard Segal described his committee as the "conduit through which the informed opinion of the bench and the bar in a given area, sifted and weighed, is objectively conveyed to the President through the Attorney General." The Standing Committee, he said, consisted of 11 members -- one from each of the federal circuits -- and its primary source of information in evaluating a prospective judge were the "opinions of the judges and lawyers of the community involved."

Segal said there were two principal reasons for rating a prospective judge as not qualified -- if he exceeded the age requirements or if he lacked significant trial experience. Segal said that the ABA considered that no one 64 years old or over should be made a federal district judge or promoted to the circuit bench, since the eligible age for retirement was 65. Only where the candidate was well qualified or exceptionally well qualified and in excellent health, Segal said, should he be named to the district bench if he was 60 years or older. Segal also said the nominee should have a "reasonable amount of trial experience, preferably at least some of it in the federal courts."

Judgeships as Patronage

Federal judgeships are highly desirable patronage plums for a number of reasons:

District judgeships pay \$22,500 annual salary, circuit judgeships \$25,500.

Judgeships are lifetime jobs. There is no mandatory retirement age. A judge may retire at age 65 after 15 years on the bench or at age 70 after 10 years on the bench. A judge who retires after 10 years' service gets full pay for the rest of his life.

Added to the financial security is the prestige of being a judge -- a particularly strong factor with lawyers, who constitute a large portion of active politicians in both parties.

And from the point of view of the Presidency, judgeships make up a fairly sizable pool of high-level, recurring patronage jobs to dispose of.

The following list gives the number of federal circuit and district judges appointed by Mr. Kennedy's three immediate predecessors during their entire terms in office, and by President Kennedy as of Oct. 26:

	Democrats	Republicans
Roosevelt	188	6
Truman	116	9
Eisenhower	9	165
Kennedy	75*	0

*One New York Liberal also was appointed.

Notable Appointments

President Kennedy Aug. 9 set a precedent when he appointed James B. Parsons to be U.S. district judge for northern Illinois -- the first Negro to be appointed to a district bench. (A Negro, William H. Hastie, had been appointed by President Harry S. Truman to sit on the third circuit court and several Negroes sit in other federal courts.) Mr. Kennedy also named two other Negroes -- Wade H. McCree Jr. to the district court for eastern Michigan and Thurgood Marshall to the second circuit court. Their careers in brief:

Marshall, 53, had been chief counsel of the National Assn. for the Advancement of Colored People since 1938 and assistant counsel for the preceding two years. He was graduated from Howard Univ. Law School, Washington, D.C., in 1933 and practiced law for three years before joining the NAACP. He had won 25 civil rights cases before the Supreme Court.

McCree, 41, had been a judge on the Wayne County, Mich., circuit bench since 1954. He was graduated from Harvard Law School in 1948 and immediately prior to being named to the bench he worked for the Michigan Workmen's Compensation Commission.

Parson, 50, had been judge of Cook County, Ill., since Aug. 31, 1960, prior to which he was assistant U.S. attorney for northern Illinois. He was graduated from the University of Chicago Law School in 1949.

One Member of Congress, Rep. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, 62, was named a judge by Mr. Kennedy -- to fill a vacancy on the district court in eastern Michigan. Machrowicz represented Michigan's 1st district (Detroit) since 1951, before which he served as a municipal judge. (Weekly Report p. 1592).

List of Judges Named by President Kennedy

Following is a list of all of the judgeships which have been, or are available to be, filled by President Kennedy. They consist of 10 new circuit court posts and 63 new district court positions created by Congress under Public Law 87-36, and 39 other vacancies on district or circuit benches due to retirements or deaths. Where the post had been filled as of Oct. 26, the name of the nominee is given, along with his age, political party affiliation and, where the appointment had been confirmed by the Senate, the ABA rating. The ratings are identified as follows: exceptionally well qualified (v), well qualified (w), qualified (x), not qualified (y) and not available or not provided (z).

New Circuit Court Posts

1. Second circuit -- Irving R. Kaufman, 51, Dem. (w)
2. Second circuit -- Thurgood Marshall, 53, Dem.
3. Second circuit -- Paul R. Hays, 58, Liberal
4. Third circuit -- J. Cullen Ganey, 62, Dem. (w)
5. Fourth circuit -- Albert V. Bryan, 62 Dem. (v)
6. Fourth circuit -- J. Spencer Bell, 55, Dem. (x)
7. Fifth circuit -- Griffin B. Bell, 40, Dem.
8. Fifth Circuit -- Walter P. Gewin, 52, Dem.
9. Seventh circuit -- Luther M. Swygert, 56, Dem. (x)
10. Tenth circuit -- Delmas C. Hill, 55, Dem. (w)

New District Court Posts

1. Alabama, northern -- Clarence W. Allgood, 59, Dem.
2. Alaska -- Raymond E. Plummer, 48, Dem. (x)
3. Arizona -- Arthur M. Davis, 54, Dem. (v)
4. Arkansas --
5. California, northern -- Thomas J. MacBride, 47, Dem. (x)
6. California, northern -- Alfonso J. Zirpoli, 56, Dem. (w)
7. California, southern --
8. California, southern --
9. Colorado -- William E. Doyle, 50, Dem. (x)
10. Connecticut -- M. Joseph Blumenfeld, 57, Dem. (x)
11. Connecticut -- T. Emmett Clarie, 48, Dem. (w)
12. Florida, southern -- David W. Dyer, 51, Dem. (v)
13. Florida, southern --
14. Georgia, northern -- Lewis R. Morgan, 48, Dem. (w)
15. Illinois, northern -- Hubert L. Will, 57, Dem. (w)
16. Illinois, northern --
17. Indiana, northern --
18. Indiana, southern -- S. Hugh Dillin, 47, Dem. (w)
19. Iowa --
20. Kansas --
21. Louisiana, eastern -- Elmer G. West, 46, Dem. (x)
22. Louisiana, eastern -- Robert A. Ainsworth Jr., 51, Dem. (w)
23. Louisiana, western -- Richard J. Putnam, 48, Dem. (w)
24. Maryland -- Edward S. Northrop, 50, Dem. (w)
25. Maryland --
26. Massachusetts --
27. Michigan, eastern -- Wade H. McCree Jr., 41, Dem. (w)
28. Michigan, eastern -- Talbot Smith, 61, Dem.
29. Mississippi, southern -- William H. Cox, 60, Dem. (v)
30. Missouri, western -- Floyd R. Gibson, 51, Dem. (x)
31. Nevada --
32. New Jersey -- Anthony T. Augelli, 58, Dem. (w)
33. New York, eastern -- John F. Dooling, Jr., 53, Dem. (v)
34. New York, eastern -- George Rosling, 60, Dem.
35. New York, southern -- Thomas F. Croake, 59, Dem. (w)
36. New York, southern -- Dudley B. Bonsal, 54, Dem.
37. New York, southern -- Irving B. Cooper, 59, Dem.
38. New York, southern -- Wilfred Feinberg, 41, Dem.
39. New York, southern --

40. New York, southern --
41. North Carolina, eastern -- John D. Larkins Jr., 52, Dem. (x)
42. North Carolina, western -- James B. Craven Jr., 43, Dem. (w)
43. North Carolina, middle -- L. Richardson Preyer, 42, Dem.
44. Ohio, northern -- Frank J. Battisti, 39, Dem. (x)
45. Oklahoma -- Frederick A. Daugherty, 47, Dem.
46. Pennsylvania, eastern -- Joseph S. Lord III, 49, Dem. (w)
47. Pennsylvania, eastern -- Abraham L. Freedman, 57, Dem. (v)
48. Pennsylvania, eastern -- Alfred J. Luongo, 41, Dem. (x)
49. Pennsylvania, western -- Edward Dumbauld, 55, Dem. (w)
50. Pennsylvania, western --
51. Pennsylvania, middle -- Michael H. Sheridan, 49, Dem. (w)
52. Puerto Rico --
53. South Carolina -- James R. Martin Jr., 51, Dem. (v)
54. Tennessee, eastern --
55. Tennessee, middle --
56. Tennessee, western -- Bailey Brown, 44, Dem. (x)
57. Texas, northern -- Sarah T. Hughes, 65, Dem.
58. Texas, northern -- Leo Brewster, 57, Dem.
59. Texas, southern -- James L. Noel Jr., 51, Dem.
60. Texas, western -- Adrian A. Spears, 51, Dem.
61. Washington --
62. (temp.) Ohio, northern -- Ben. C. Green, 56, Dem.
63. (temp.) Ohio, southern -- John W. Peck, 43, Dem.

Vacancies Due to Retirement, Death

1. Third circuit -- William F. Smith, 58, Dem. (w)
2. Seventh circuit -- Roger T. Kiley, 60, Dem. (w)
3. Eighth circuit -- Albert Ridge, 62, Dem. (w)
4. Eighth circuit --
5. Ninth circuit -- James R. Browning, 42, Dem. (y)
6. Ninth circuit -- Ben C. Duniway, 53, Dem. (w)
7. Tenth circuit --
8. California, southern -- Albert L. Stephens Jr., 48, Dem. (w)
9. California, southern --
10. Canal Zone -- Gutherie F. Crowe, 51, Dem. (z)
11. District of Columbia --
12. District of Columbia --
13. Florida, southern -- William A. McRae Jr., 60, Dem. (z)
14. Florida, northern & southern -- George C. Young, 45, Dem. (w)
15. Georgia, middle --
16. Guam -- Paul D. Shriver, 61, Dem. (z)
17. Hawaii -- C. Nils Tavares, 59, Rep. (w)
18. Hawaii -- Martin Pence, 56, Dem. (w)
19. Illinois, northern -- Richard B. Austin, 60, Dem. (x)
20. Illinois, northern -- James B. Parsons, 50, Dem. (w)
21. Iowa, northern --
22. Massachusetts -- Andrew J. Caffrey, 40, Rep. (w)
23. Michigan, eastern --
24. Michigan, eastern -- Rep. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz (1st dist., Mich.), 62, Dem. (w)
25. Michigan, western --
26. Minnesota -- Earl R. Larson, 50, Dem. (x)
27. Missouri, western -- William H. Becker, 52, Dem. (w)
28. New Jersey --
29. New Jersey --
30. New York, southern --
31. Oklahoma -- Luther L. Bohanon, 59, Dem. (y)
32. Oklahoma, northern --
33. Pennsylvania, eastern --
34. Pennsylvania, eastern --
35. Tennessee, eastern -- Frank W. Wilson, 44, Dem. (w)
36. Texas, southern -- Reynaldo G. Garza, 46, Dem. (x)
37. Virginia, western -- Thomas J. Michie, 65, Dem. (v)
38. Virginia, eastern --
39. Washington, western -- William T. Beeks, 55, Dem. (w)

Committee Roundup

EXPORT CONTROL POLICY

COMMITTEE -- Senate Judiciary, Internal Security Subcommittee.

HELD HEARINGS -- Oct. 23 and 24 on U.S. control of exports to Russia and the Soviet bloc.

BACKGROUND -- The extent of U.S. aid and trade with Russia, China and Sino-Soviet satellites, including Poland and Yugoslavia, was often at issue during the first session of the 87th Congress. Some highlights:

- President Kennedy March 8 told a press conference that new procedures to facilitate "better judgment" on licensing products for export to the Soviet bloc would be adopted following a disagreement between the Defense and Commerce Departments over the licensing for export to Russia of \$1.5 million worth of precision machine tools used in the production of ball-bearings. Defense Department objection that the tools could be put to military use had resulted in cancellation of the license March 2 after it had been approved by Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges and his predecessor Frederick H. Mueller (August 1959-January 1961). Mr. Kennedy said the U.S. was "anxious to permit some degree of trade which does not weaken our national security" since other Western nations trade with the Soviet bloc. (Weekly Report p. 391)

- The Senate May 11 passed a bill (S 1215) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Battle Act) to permit the President to extend economic and financial aid to any nation, except the Soviet Union or Communist areas in the Far East, if such aid was important to U.S. security. The House took no action on the measure which was one of President Kennedy's 16 "priorities". (Weekly Report p. 1611)

- In considering the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (PL 87-195) Congress rejected attempts to deny aid to several listed members of the Sino-Soviet bloc, including Yugoslavia and Poland. It also rejected a proposal by Sen. Styles Bridges (R N.H.) to prohibit military and economic aid to countries which exported strategic materials to Communist countries. Opponents of the amendments said they would negate the discretionary power in the original Battle Act and the proposed Battle Act amendments. (Weekly Report p. 1466)

- A controversy arose Oct. 15 over sale of 130 U.S. F-86D jet fighters to Yugoslavia in March and U.S. training of Yugoslav pilots. Former President Eisenhower said the sale of planes was "in the best interest of the United States," and a White House statement said the sale carried forward the policy of the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations toward Yugoslavia. The statement said the entire U.S. policy toward Yugoslavia was currently being reconsidered. (Weekly Report p. 1767)

TESTIMONY -- Oct. 23 -- In an opening statement Sen. Kenneth B. Keating (R N.Y.) said study of the Government's export control policy was "long overdue." Keating said the Committee wanted to know what the Defense Department's role was in determining policy and making decisions on exports to Communist countries, whether U.S. policy toward Yugoslavia and Poland was wise, whether everything possible was done to prevent

re-export of U.S. goods to Communist countries from friendly or neutral nations and what relative weights were given economic and security considerations when making decisions on exports.

Joseph A. Gwyer, a Library of Congress research specialist on leave of absence to serve on the staff of the House Select Committee on Export Control (see below) said all aid should be denied Yugoslavia and Poland. He said nothing of "significance" or of "strategic value" should be traded with Russia because in a state-controlled economy any non-military items bought abroad freed industry to concentrate on military output. He said Russia wanted to buy machine tools from the U.S. to speed up industrial automation.

Oct. 24 -- Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs Jack N. Behrman said licensing procedures for exports to Soviet-bloc countries had been tightened in recent months, but the United States had no way of determining to what extent subsidiaries of U.S. companies abroad were shipping equipment and materials to the Soviet bloc. He said a recent licensed export of \$1,455,000 worth of synthetic rubber to Russia was not militarily significant since the rubber was not suitable for heavy trucks or aircraft. Behrman said arms were sent to Yugoslavia for defensive purposes, but were denied the Dominican Republic because they might be used in aggressive actions. Behrman also said federal agents had seized \$500,000 worth of contraband goods destined for Cuba since the beginning of 1961.

Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs Philip H. Trezise said all exports to Yugoslavia, Poland and other Sino-Soviet bloc countries involved "calculated risks" that the goods would not be re-shipped to the Soviet Union. He said agreement not to re-export U.S. goods without U.S. permission was not customarily written into compacts because "some Governments do not consider this a proper subject for a political agreement."

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- Oct. 25 -- The House Select Committee on Export Control, established Sept. 7, held executive session hearings on exports to the Soviet bloc. Hodges and Secretary of State Dean Rusk testified on recent revisions in the administration of the policy governing exports to Communist countries. (Weekly Report p. 1660)

NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY

COMMITTEE -- Senate Government Operations, National Policy Machinery Subcommittee.

ACTION -- Oct. 23 issued its sixth and final staff report, on the Bureau of the Budget and the budgetary process.

Based in part on hearings held during July and August 1961, the report concluded the Subcommittee's inquiry into the Government's methods for making and executing cold war strategy. The Subcommittee, established in 1959, earlier issued reports dealing with recruitment of private citizens for Government service, the Secretary of State, super cabinet officers, the National Security Council, and science organizations at the Presidential level. (Weekly Report p. 1520)

The report recommended that the President rely on "his strong right arm" -- the Budget Bureau -- to monitor and coordinate the "spiraling complexity" of U.S. foreign and defense policy. It said the budgetary process was the President's most powerful instrument for establishing a system of national priorities and urged that federal budget-making be "modernized and updated" as a main tool of forward planning.

The report placed its recommendations within the context of America's need for "a forward and affirmative national strategy" in the cold war. The President's task, it said, was to create such a strategy and establish an order of priorities on its behalf. The report called the budgetary process the President's most effective means of setting national priorities and marshalling through Congress the resources required.

The report criticized the view that the Budget Bureau is a "Certified Presidential Accounting Office". It urged instead that the Budget Director sit "in the innermost policy councils" of the Presidency and that the Bureau act as the President's "lengthened shadow" in fiscal policy and program management by:

- Pulling together into "one comprehensive reckoning" information on all competing claims of national policy.
- Controlling the Executive branch through its "most sensitive pressure point -- the pocketbook never".

The report recommended the Bureau be staffed "more broadly and richly" with officials able to grasp the "significance of programs in terms of the President's overall policy objective". It urged revision of existing methods of budget presentation to make the annual document "shorter, simpler, and easier to read."

To make the budgetary process a "more versatile and useful tool" the report also recommended:

- Extending budgetary time horizons to take greater account of the consequences of current budgetary decisions. (It commended budgetary reforms now underway and emphasized that forward budgeting can be no better than the "forward planning which underlies it".)

- Devising new methods of budget presentation with emphasis on: program packaging in terms of Defense Department missions, country development programming, and coordinated forward budgets for programs dispersed among several agencies.

- Developing improved ways of measuring program effectiveness.

LABELING INQUIRY

COMMITTEE -- Senate Judiciary, Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

RESUMED HEARINGS -- On packaging and labeling practices affecting consumers. (Weekly Report p. 1212) Testimony:

Oct. 25 -- Roy King, editor of Food Field Reporter, said that some food packages are not filled to the top because manufacturers, as a protection against shoplifting, make containers too big to be slipped into the housewife's pocketbook. King said that packaging practices "may appear deceptive to the layman" but actually are not because "without attractive packaging the housewife would not enjoy the appeal that is being made to her emotions." King said he questioned "the validity of Governmental interest in packaging."

J. Arnold Anderson, vice President of Safeway Stores Inc., said that while it might seem desirable to have simplified, specific standards and rules for packaging

and labeling, "there is a danger of creating rigidity that may remove competitive choices in the market place" to the detriment of consumers. He said Government regulation of packaging might "suppress innovation and thwart constructive changes and progress in food distribution."

Mrs. Dorothy K. Wheeler, of Greenbelt Consumer Services Inc., presented: a "giant size" detergent in the same size box as a rival containing 33 percent less soaphakes; and a cake mix in a box 20 percent larger than its rival but containing less mix. Such packaging constituted "one of the biggest frauds perpetrated on the American public," she said. On the net contents of packages, Mrs. Wheeler said there was "a constant reduction in size in such small quantities that the consumer is unaware of the change." She urged passage of a law authorizing the Federal Government to regulate the size of containers.

Oct. 26 -- Louis Cheskin, director, Louis Cheskin Associates Marketing Research and Color Research Institute, Chicago, Ill., said requiring that the weight of a product be printed on the front of a can or carton would "mutilate the psychological appeal of the package." He said he opposed any "regimenting" of packaging because it would lead to making everyone wear the same clothes and live in the same kind of houses.

Dr. Edmund J. Faison, director, Visual Research Inc., Chicago, said he hoped the hearings would encourage the industry "to set up packaging and labeling codes which would help avoid consumer confusion." He opposed additional legislation to regularize packaging. He said the common practice of trimming the size of packages rather than raising prices to meet costs was determined by consumer demand because consumers would rather get less than pay more.

Oct. 27 -- Paul Willis, president of the Grocery Manufacturers of America Inc., said the Subcommittee hearings had "already accomplished a great deal" in alerting management to review labels and packages. He said at least nine federal agencies were already policing the food industry, and existing laws were adequate.

DRUG ANTITRUST BILL

COMMITTEE -- Senate Judiciary, Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

CONTINUED HEARINGS -- On a bill (S 1552) to amend and supplement the antitrust laws with respect to drug manufacture and distribution. (Weekly Report p. 1765) Testimony:

Oct. 18 -- Paul S. Bolger of the New York Patent Law Assn. opposed the bill. He said it would "irreparably damage the patent system" and stifle invention.

Glenn Wilson of Nationwide Insurance Companies, supported S 1552. He said research "neither ceased nor diminished in countries which do not permit patents on drugs."

Dr. Henry B. Hass of the Research Directors Assn. said the Government should not limit patent protection for drugs but should provide even greater protections to encourage the drug industry to expand its research activities.

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- Oct. 19 -- The National Wholesale Druggists Assn. adopted a resolution opposing passage of S 1552 without a study of the effect of the bill on the public and the drug industry.

ODDS TIGHTEN IN KEY '61 RACES; PRESIDENT CAMPAIGNS

A tightening of the odds in the key New York, New Jersey and Texas election battles, coupled with direct campaigning by President Kennedy in the former two areas, marked the final week of the 1961 off-year election campaign. (For full rundown on the races of the year and general outlook, see Weekly Report p. 1775)

NEW JERSEY GOVERNOR RACE -- Reports indicate that former Superior Court Judge Richard J. Hughes (D) may have narrowed the lead formerly enjoyed by the Republican gubernatorial candidate, former Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell. Recent New Jersey polls taken by E. John Bucci, the professional pollster of Philadelphia Democratic boss William J. Green's organization, have shown Hughes with at least 50 percent of the vote. The Bucci polls, which contradicted other Democratic polls and a Newark Star-Ledger survey indicating a lead of approximately 100,000 for Mitchell, played an important part in Mr. Kennedy's Oct. 27 decision to reverse his previous policy of non-involvement and speak Nov. 2 in Trenton at a Hughes rally.

In his address the President said federal-state cooperation can best be obtained "by a Democratic Administration in Washington working with a Democratic administration in Trenton." With a Democratic Governor, he indicated, New Jersey would have less difficulty in obtaining federal aid for housing, medical care, welfare, highway projects, school lunch allotments, disaster relief, civil defense and flood control. An enthusiastic crowd of approximately 20,000 turned out for the Kennedy-Hughes rally in Trenton.

Despite Hughes' apparent gains, observers were still rating Mitchell a slight favorite.

NEW YORK MAYOR RACE -- Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz, the Republican candidate for Mayor, is reported to be gaining ground in his race against incumbent Mayor Robert F. Wagner (D). New York observers still expect Wagner to win, but it is acknowledged that his majority may be very low and that Lefkowitz actually has a chance of pulling an upset in the heavily Democratic city.

A Republican poll released Nov. 2 showed Wagner with 42 percent of the vote, Lefkowitz with 39 percent, independent Democratic candidate Lawrence E. Gerosa with 10 percent and 9 percent undecided.

Before his Nov. 2 appearance in New Jersey, President Kennedy stopped in New York, made a brief statement in Wagner's support and rode in an automobile from the airport to center city with Wagner. Mr. Kennedy said Wagner had unmatched experience in coping with New York's problems and said it was important to his own program to have a New York Mayor who shared his convictions.

Lefkowitz, aided by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller (R) and other GOP leaders, continued his vigorous attacks on alleged corruption and lack of strong anti-crime measures on the part of the Wagner Administration.

New York State Democratic Chairman Michael H. Prendergast Nov. 1 announced his support of Gerosa, saying that Wagner has sold his "political soul" to an

"unholy alliance" of the Liberal party and reform Democratic movement whose real goal, he said, was to wreck the Democratic party. Former Tammany boss Carmine G. De Sario Nov. 2 said he would not support Wagner, but endorsed no other candidate. Some observers thought the Prendergast and De Sario announcements might actually benefit Wagner by giving him an opportunity to revive the "bossism" issue on which he won a stunning primary victory. Wagner charges the "bosses" want to see him defeated so that they can recapture complete control of the party in the city.

TEXAS 20th DISTRICT ELECTION -- Observers report on increasingly tight race between State Sen. Henry B. Gonzalez (D) and attorney John W. Goode Jr. (R) in the Nov. 4 special House election in San Antonio to elect a successor to Rep. Paul J. Kilday (D), who retired from Congress to accept a judgeship. Gonzalez had previously been rated a clear favorite.

The campaign is being fought out on clear ideological lines. Goode, 37, has hit hard at Gonzalez' liberal connections, such as his membership on the board of Americans for Democratic Action. Gonzalez, 44, has cited his experience as a city councilman, mayor pro tem and State Senator in contrast to Goode's work as a Republican county chairman.

Former President Eisenhower, appearing in San Antonio Oct. 30 in Goode's behalf, appealed for development of two-party government in predominantly Democratic Texas. "Any party that is in power too long," he said, "can become indifferent to the need for integrity and efficiency in government."

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- In a technically non-political trip to Arkansas and Oklahoma Oct. 29, the President met Sen. J.W. Fulbright (D Ark.), Gov. Orval E. Faubus (D Ark.) and Rep. Dale Alford (D Ark.) at Fort Smith, Ark. The President said Fulbright "has labored for a strong United States in a peaceful world -- and also spoke for the interests of Arkansas."

The President also spoke at the opening of the Ouachita National Forest Road in Oklahoma and spent the night as the guest of Sen. Robert S. Kerr (D Okla.). The Oklahoma visit was interpreted by some observers as a move by the President to enlist Kerr's support for his legislative program.

LOUISIANA 4th DISTRICT PRIMARY

Democratic voters in the Louisiana 4th Congressional District (Northwest, Shreveport) Oct. 28 nominated Joe D. Waggoner of Plain Dealing, a militant segregationist, to be their candidate in the Dec. 19 special election to fill the seat of the late Rep. Overton Brooks (D). The complete, unofficial vote: Waggoner 27,508, Marvin Bass 5,289, George Miller 969, Joe Monroe 439 and Mrs. Sophie Thompson 434.

Republican Charlton H. Lyons Sr., a wealthy oilman, is expected to offer serious opposition to Waggoner in the special election. (Weekly Report p. 1770)

DISALLE RETIREMENT

Ohio Gov. Michael V. DiSalle (D) Oct. 21 announced he would not seek re-election in 1962. His announcement immediately caused a flurry of speculation both as to his successor and the fate of his legislative program.

DiSalle said that as a non-candidate he would be "free of the charges of self perpetuation in office" so that he could "best interpret the needs of the people of this state."

He announced that he would begin a speaking tour of the state in the hope of creating a favorable "climate of opinion" for his legislative program.

DiSalle's announcement came three weeks before the state General Assembly (Legislature) was due to convene in special session to consider the state fiscal appropriations. DiSalle vetoed an appropriations bill passed in the regular session after the Republican-controlled General Assembly sliced \$34 million from his request.

The actual effect of DiSalle's decision not to run, according to some Ohio observers, may be to hamper the possibility of increased appropriations by eroding the political influence of a Governor able to succeed himself.

DiSalle's retirement from the Governor's office is also expected to have far-reaching effects upon the Democratic party in Ohio. There are four main Democratic prospects to succeed DiSalle: Cleveland Mayor Anthony J. Celebrezze, state Attorney General Mark McElroy, Highway Safety Director J. Grant Keys and Lieutenant Governor John W. Donahey.

Celebrezze, who is currently in the midst of a campaign for a fifth term as Mayor of Cleveland, is considered the leading possibility. He ran second to DiSalle in the 1958 Democratic gubernatorial primary.

McElroy, another native of Cleveland who could be expected to run well in Cuyahoga County, has been preparing to bid for the gubernatorial nomination. He is said to have built a strong statewide organization while serving as Attorney General. If both McElroy and Celebrezze should run in the Democratic primary the huge primary vote of Cuyahoga County could be split and the nomination might go to a candidate who ran well in other parts of the state.

Keys has been widely regarded as DiSalle's "heir apparent" and as such could be expected to get at least DiSalle's tacit support. Keys is also widely known throughout the state. After announcing his decision not to run, DiSalle said he had a favorite for the party's nomination who he felt "couldn't be elected." DiSalle declined to identify him.

Donahey is not likely to try for the nomination unless DiSalle resigns before the end of his term and propels Donahey into the Governor's chair. In case he should be acting Governor, Donahey has said he will try for the nomination.

Another result of DiSalle's announcement is expected to be the replacement of Democratic State Chairman William L. Coleman, whom DiSalle supported for state chairman in 1956. Ray T. Miller Sr., Cuyahoga County Democratic Chairman, who is unfriendly to DiSalle, may well be able to control the choice of the new state chairman. Coleman is said to be interested in running for Ohio's at-large congressional seat in 1962.

DiSalle was elected Governor in 1958 with a 453,438 vote plurality in a campaign in which the "right-to-work" issue crippled the usually effective Republican campaign effort in the state. From the outset of his term, DiSalle

suffered a series of political setbacks, the most serious stemming from the increased taxes he pushed through the Democratic-controlled General Assembly in 1959. (See 1960 Weekly Report p. 2009) In 1960 Republicans regained control of the General Assembly and proceeded to block the major part of DiSalle's programs for increased social welfare. Most Ohio observers believed he could not be re-elected in 1962.

The Columbus Dispatch Oct. 22 reported DiSalle would be interested in a federal post such as that of Secretary of Urban Affairs if Congress creates such a department. DiSalle was previously reported as saying that if he did not run for office in 1962, he might run in 1964. That is the year the term of Sen. Stephen M. Young (D Ohio) expires.

Possible Republican candidates for Governor in 1962 include state Auditor James O. Rhodes, House Speaker Roger Cloud and State Rep. Robert A. Taft Jr., son of the late Senator.

CONNECTICUT GOVERNORSHIP

John D. Alsop, president of the Mutual Insurance Company of Hartford, Oct. 27 announced his candidacy for the Republican nomination for Governor of Connecticut in 1962. Alsop, brother of writers Stewart and Joseph Alsop, lost the 1958 GOP gubernatorial nomination to Fred R. Zeller in a close battle at the state GOP convention. Zeller was defeated by former Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff (D) in the general election.

In the statement announcing his candidacy, Alsop listed as the main issues the establishment of a more equitable state tax system and the creation of more jobs for the state's growing population.

Alsop's chief contender for the GOP nomination is expected to be state Republican chairman Edwin H. May Jr. of Wethersfield. Although May's supporters have opened a statewide drive to "urge" May to seek the nomination, he has said he will make no decision about running until after the state municipal elections Nov. 7.

Other possible but unannounced candidates for the GOP gubernatorial nomination include former Gov. and Ambassador John D. Lodge; speaker of the state House of Representatives Anthony Wallace; state Sens. Peter Mariani and John Lupton; former state Sen. Newman E. Marsilius; and House majority leader J. Tyler Patterson.

Incumbent Gov. John N. Dempsey (D), who succeeded to the Governorship when Ribicoff resigned to become Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, is expected to win nomination to a full term without opposition. Soon after assuming the Governorship Dempsey felt compelled to ask the Legislature for \$126 million in new taxes, a suggestion which seriously damaged his political popularity in the state. State political observers do not believe he would be nearly as attractive a candidate as Ribicoff. Republicans are given a good chance of winning the Governorship in 1962, provided the Alsop-May competition for the nomination does not create party divisions that would seriously hamper the GOP in the general election.

Some Connecticut observers, noting the steady rise in Democratic strength over the past few years under the leadership of Ribicoff and State Democratic Chairman (now also National Democratic Chairman) John M. Bailey, believe that the Republicans must either win the Governorship in 1962 or be consigned to the role of a permanently minority party in the state.

Under the Connecticut ballot system, which makes

it extremely difficult to split a ticket between candidates of the two parties, the winning candidate for Governor usually carries a large number of Congressional and State Legislature candidates into office with him. The 1962 re-election chances of Sen. Prescott Bush (R Conn.) and several of the state's incumbent Congressmen are thought to hinge largely on the Governorship contest. A Democratic sweep might endanger Rep. Horace Seely-Brown Jr. (R 2nd District - East) and/or Rep. Abner W. Sibal (R 4th District - Fairfield County). Most vulnerable in a GOP sweep would be Rep. Frank Kowalski Jr. (D At-Large) or Rep. John S. Monagan (D 5th District - North-western).

MASSACHUSETTS REDISTRICTING

The Democratic-controlled special redistricting committee of the Massachusetts General Court (Legislature) Oct. 22 released details of a suggested Congressional redistricting plan. It was reported that all incumbent Massachusetts Congressmen had been shown the plan and that a majority of them had expressed satisfaction with it. The plan, which creates six clearly Democratic districts, four clearly Republican districts and two toss-up districts, is expected to form the basis of negotiations between Republican Gov. John A. Volpe and leaders of the heavily Democratic General Court. Republicans have enough votes in both houses to sustain any Volpe veto.

The presumably Democratic districts under the plan would be those of Reps. Edward P. Boland (South Central - Springfield), Harold D. Donohue (South Central - Worcester), Philip J. Philbin (North Central), Torbert H. Macdonald (Northeast-Chelsea, Medford), Majority Leader John W. McCormack (Boston) and Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. (Northeast - Cambridge). Added Republican towns might cause some problems for Philbin, but he has always run well in GOP areas. The district of incumbent Rep. James A. Burke (D - South Shore - Quincy) would pick up several Republican towns which might make the district doubtful.

The presumably Republican districts would be those of Reps. Silvio O. Conte (West - Holyoke, Pittsfield), Joseph M. Martin Jr. (South Central - Brookline, Newton, Attleboro), Hastings Keith (Cape Cod - Fall River) and William H. Bates (Northeast - Gloucester, Salem). All of these except the Conte district would include considerable new Democratic areas, however.

The districts currently represented by Reps. Thomas J. Lane (D) and F. Bradford Morse (R) would be combined into a new Northeast district including both Lowell and Lawrence. Lane and Morse would presumably fight it out for the seat, with a close race anticipated.

Republican Rep. Laurence Curtis' district (Boston, Brookline, Newton) would be absorbed into neighboring districts. Curtis' home would actually be in McCormack's overwhelmingly Democratic Boston district.

Republicans also presented a redistricting plan, but its chances in the Democratic General Court were considered negligible.

Democratic leaders said their tentative plan was still open to alteration. The redistricting committee's recommendations will be considered by the General Court in January. Massachusetts lost two of its current 14 seats under the 1960 Census apportionment and all remaining 12 seats must be elected at large in 1962 if no new plan is agreed on. Sentiment to risk an at-large election, which was at a high during the summer, is reportedly abating in both parties.

Dates of 1962 State Primaries

The dates for the 1962 Congressional Primary Elections, as reported to CQ by the Secretaries of State of the 50 states, are as follows:

ALABAMA -- May 1, runoff May 15.
ALASKA -- Aug. 14 (subject to change to Aug. 28 in 1962 meeting of Legislature).
ARIZONA -- Sept. 11.
ARKANSAS -- July 31, runoff Aug. 14.
CALIFORNIA -- June 5.
COLORADO -- Sept. 11.
CONNECTICUT -- "...eighth Wednesday following the day of the close of the State Convention of such party....'Party Conventions shall be convened not earlier than June 1st nor later than July 15th.'"
DELAWARE -- Aug. 18.
FLORIDA -- May 8, runoff May 29.
GEORGIA -- Primary date set by the party Executive Committees, which have not convened.
HAWAII -- Oct. 6.
IDAHO -- June 5, runoff June 26.
ILLINOIS -- April 10.
INDIANA -- May 8.
IOWA -- June 4.
KANSAS -- Aug. 5.
KENTUCKY -- May 29.
LOUISIANA -- July 28, runoff Sept. 1.
MAINE -- June 18.
MARYLAND -- May 15.
MASSACHUSETTS -- Sept. 18 (tentative).
MICHIGAN -- Aug. 7.
MINNESOTA -- Sept. 11.
MISSISSIPPI -- June 5, runoff June 26.
MISSOURI -- Aug. 7.
MONTANA -- June 5.
NEBRASKA -- May 15.
NEVADA -- Sept. 4.
NEW HAMPSHIRE -- Sept. 11.
NEW JERSEY -- April 17.
NEW MEXICO -- May 8.
NEW YORK -- Date will be set by legislature.
NORTH CAROLINA -- May 26, runoff June 23.
NORTH DAKOTA -- June 26.
OHIO -- May 8.
OKLAHOMA -- May 1, runoff May 22.
OREGON -- May 18.
PENNSYLVANIA -- May 15.
RHODE ISLAND -- Sept. 11 (tentative).
SOUTH CAROLINA -- June 12.
SOUTH DAKOTA -- June 5.
TENNESSEE -- Aug. 6.
TEXAS -- May 5, runoff June 2.
UTAH -- Sept. 11.
VERMONT -- Sept. 11.
VIRGINIA -- July 10 (If candidates are declared nominees without opposition no primary will be held).
WASHINGTON -- Sept. 11.
WEST VIRGINIA -- May 8.
WISCONSIN -- Sept. 11.
WYOMING -- Aug. 21.

TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S OCT. 26 BUDGET STATEMENT

Following is the text of an Oct. 26 statement by the President to Cabinet officers and agency heads on the 1962 and 1963 budget outlook: (See p. 1794)

I have asked you to meet with me today to discuss the current outlook for the federal budget.

The budget reflects national policy. This year our national policy has emphasized: strengthening the defenses against threats to world peace in Berlin, Southeast Asia, and elsewhere; bringing about recovery from economic recession; and laying firmer foundations for long-term growth in national welfare and security.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS LISTED

Our accomplishments have been substantial.

In the military field, the 6.4 billion dollar increase in appropriations over the previous administration's budget provides for a 50 percent higher production target for Polaris missile-carrying submarines; a doubling of our capacity to produce Minuteman intercontinental missiles; many more strategic bombers placed on ground alert; an increase by nearly one-half in the number of combat-ready Army divisions; and increases in air and sea lift capacity, tactical air power, stocks of weapons and ammunition, and many other aspects of our military strength.

In the vital area of United States assistance to the economic and military strength of other countries to buttress their independence from communism, I regret that the Congress did not support my request for additional appropriations, (and in fact appropriated 90 million dollars less than the previous administration's proposal of 4 billion dollars). Nevertheless the new AID legislation accomplishes major improvements in the organization and management of these programs. A new AID Administrator is giving unified leadership to the entire effort, and new and stronger criteria of self-help and long-range planning are being applied to aided countries.

With respect to the recession, strong action by the Government, coupled with the recuperative forces in the private economy, reversed the downward trend of jobs and incomes early in the year and brought steady and strong recovery. The annual rate of national output has risen from a low of \$01 billion dollars in the first quarter of calendar 1961 to \$26 billion dollars in the third quarter. There is every indication that this strong rise will continue into 1962. Direct budgetary costs for anti-recession purposes will be about 600 million dollars in fiscal 1962 above the previous administration's budget -- providing for temporary extended unemployment compensation benefits, aid to dependent children of the unemployed, increases in surplus food distribution (including the pilot food stamp program), and the area redevelopment program. More than half of these funds will later be returned to the Treasury in special unemployment taxes authorized when the extended benefits were enacted.

In the field of housing and community development, new and more effective legislation has been enacted, carrying forward tested programs such as urban renewal to attack blighted and slum areas, and adding new programs, such as aid for the acquisition of open space in urban areas and assistance to urban mass transit. Expenditures are up 350 million dollars in fiscal 1962 over the proposals of the previous administration; were it not for the necessity to devote so much of our resources to defense, a strong case could be made for more rapid increases in federal participation in the joint federal-state-local effort to meet the enormous and growing problems of community development in cities and towns.

In agriculture, we can take pride in the resurgence this year of farm income. Beginning steps have been taken -- although thus far with inadequate legislative tools -- in the intricate and necessarily time-consuming process of adjusting our impressive agricultural productive capacity to the needs of domestic and foreign

requirements. Our new programs for feed grains and wheat are preventing substantial unneeded production and although costs are high this year, these programs are expected to avoid the heavy future costs that would have accompanied the continuation of previous programs. We have stepped up the Food for Peace program. However, the effects of exceptionally good weather and rising farm productivity have brought higher than anticipated crops and added to the cost of price support programs in the present fiscal year. We will have much to do to achieve effective adjustments in agricultural output.

While I regret very much the failure of the Congress to enact legislation for general aid to education, expenditures for scientific research (including medical research) and education will rise by 170 million dollars over the proposals of the previous administration, even excluding the large increases in funds for military and space research. The scientific and technological gains that will be achieved as a result of the national research effort (including military and space research) will be of the utmost importance to the future growth and strength of our Nation.

Looking at these and other fields of national effort, it is clear that the increases in the budget this year are yielding important returns -- that our military security has increased sharply -- that the vigor of the recovery from the recent recession has been strengthened -- that wages, farm income, corporate profits and the gross national product have all risen sharply -- and that in areas of health, natural resources, science and other activities strong gains are being made.

PRUDENT BUDGET POLICY

From the beginning this administration has followed a prudent budget policy in meeting national needs. With your cooperation it was possible to send to the Congress appropriation requests more than one billion dollars below the amounts originally asked by your departments and agencies. Furthermore, we have taken steps during the present year to save tens of millions of dollars by actions to improve efficiency. Modern cost-saving machines have been installed; field offices have been merged or closed; interdepartmental and advisory committees have been abolished; publications and exhibits have been curtailed; procurement practices have been tightened; greater use has been made of scrap and surplus material; wasteful duplications and variations have been eliminated; administrative structures have been streamlined; and other operations have been reorganized, pooled, consolidated or abolished.

Special efforts have been made to achieve substantial savings by making our defense establishment lean, fit, and efficient. The Defense budget submitted in March reflected savings in this fiscal year alone of over 700 million dollars in projects, programs and installations which were either unproven or unnecessary in the light of our new missile buildup and general defense posture. A new central supply agency for the Department of Defense has been established and is already saving significant sums.

In both the defense and non-defense fields, this administration resisted attempts to increase expenditures beyond the level justified in budget requests. Our proposals in the area of social insurance were all self-financed. We sought to make the highway program self-supporting, without a drain on general revenues.

Now that the Congress has adjourned, the budget has been reviewed in the light of congressional actions and other events since the budget proposals and estimates were made. The current outlook re-emphasizes the necessity to conduct the necessary work of the Government at the lowest possible cost, to eliminate or defer low priority activities, and to limit the number of Government employees to the absolute minimum.

The position on the revenue side is essentially unchanged from the estimates of some months ago. Revenues being collected in fiscal 1962 reflect incomes earned during calendar 1961 and therefore are depressed by the effects of the recent recession.

Indeed, had there been no recession in 1960-61 the budget would today be in surplus even with all the additional expenditures for defense and other purposes.

On the expenditure side, there are a number of increases compared with the position some months ago. The Congress failed to increase postal rates to meet a postal deficit of some three-quarters of a billion dollars. The necessity of calling up two additional divisions and thousands of other servicemen, as well as the general speedup in procurement and construction which accompanies an increase in military readiness, have brought about a sharper rise in defense expenditures than was previously foreseen. Excellent weather conditions, and increased productivity from machines and fertilizer, have boosted this year's crops and the accompanying price support costs to large proportions which will be difficult to reduce until the Congress enacts adequate farm legislation.

LARGER DEFICIT

With these increases in expenditures the estimated deficit for the current year has risen. There is general agreement that under the present conditions of high unemployment and recession-reduced tax receipts, a deficit is normally to be expected. It is important to make sure that the deficit is kept within reasonable limits and reflects only essential expenditures.

The present deficit -- reflecting the 1960-61 recession -- is expected to be much smaller than the 12.4 billion dollar deficit incurred in fiscal year 1959 -- reflecting the 1958-59 recession -- despite the far greater increases in defense and space expenditures in the current year. The increase in domestic civilian expenditures is less than three-fifths the increase that took place during the 1958-59 recession.

More than 80 percent of the additions this administration proposed to the previous administration's budget were for strengthening the national security or for combatting the recession, or included other sums to be repaid to the Treasury.

There is no evidence that the currently-estimated deficit presents serious risk to the domestic price level or the U.S. balance of payments. Moreover, considering the economic effect of the budget on a month-by-month basis, as contrasted to the annual totals, the current impact of Government operations is expected to change early in calendar 1962 from a net stimulative to a net restraining influence on the economy.

CUTBACKS IN SPENDING

While the recent rises in the estimates of expenditures and the deficit, therefore, are compatible with the sound fiscal and budget policies we have been following, they are further grounds for insistence on economy in executing Government programs. This is the reason I have asked each of you to follow a most careful and frugal policy with respect to commitments and expenditures under the 1962 budget as enacted by the Congress. The Congress has on many occasions made it clear that appropriations are only a ceiling, not a mandate to spend, and that department and agency heads are not required to spend every dollar appropriated. Accordingly, I have asked each of you to exercise the maximum care in scrutinizing all expenditures, tightening requirements, postponing the initiation of deferrable projects, and phasing out any acceleration of spending which was instituted as an anti-recession measure.

I am especially desirous that new programs or expansions of existing programs be undertaken with caution and deliberation, to make sure that sound criteria are used, careful plans are laid, and minimum funds are spent. I much prefer that obligational authority remain uncommitted where there is any doubt that expenditures would yield substantial returns to the national interest.

I am also especially desirous that the number of Government employees be limited to the minimum consistent with getting the job done. There is no question that employment can be held substantially below the levels which would be possible under the funds authorized by the Congress, if strong efforts are made to achieve increases in productivity and efficiency, to use better techniques of management and production, and to staff each activity with only the minimum number of employees needed to carry out our objectives. I expect each of you to make such efforts.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget informs me that the estimated expenditures for fiscal 1962 which will appear

in the autumn budget review, reflect the judgment of each of you as to what will actually be spent during this fiscal year under the policies I have outlined, and that total outlays will be substantially less than they might have been under the authority enacted by the Congress. I appreciate your continued efforts to keep uncommitted any funds, the expenditure of which is not absolutely necessary to the national interest at this time. While I know that these actions represent a cutback or postponement in many functions to which each of you attaches great importance, I congratulate you on this recognition of the over-riding requirements of a budget policy reflecting the total national interest.

Let me add a word about the 1963 budget. In view of the prospective gains in the economy, it is my intention to propose a balanced budget for that year, barring extraordinary and unforeseen defense requirements. As you know, we can expect a substantial increase in revenues under existing tax laws in fiscal 1963, reflecting the economic recovery now taking place. However, it is already clear that expenditures for the military and other elements of our national security programs will necessarily rise next year. In these circumstances it will plainly be necessary to defer or limit increases in many programs which in more normal times would be thoroughly desirable, and to shift present staffs and resources to the maximum extent from work of lower to work of higher priority. I will appreciate your cooperation in putting these policies into effect in planning the 1963 budget.

EXPORT STIMULATION

Following is an Oct. 27 announcement of steps to stimulate exports:

In my message to the Congress on Balance of Payments and Gold earlier this year, I directed the President of the Export-Import Bank to initiate measures designed to give American exporters full equality with their competitors in other countries in order to help boost the total volume of United States exports. I also asked the Secretary of the Treasury to undertake a study of methods through which private financial institutions could participate more broadly in providing export credit facilities.

These two studies have been closely coordinated and carried out under the immediate supervision of the Export-Import Bank, with policy guidance from the Secretary of the Treasury and the National Advisory Council. I am pleased to announce two fundamental and complementary steps to achieve the objectives of stimulating American exports, strengthening the balance of payments of our country, and enlisting maximum cooperation of private credit facilities.

The new programs are intended to be fully comparable with those offered abroad, particularly with respect to small and medium sized export concerns and with respect to assistance in the financing of consumer goods exports.

The first new program consists of a system of export credit insurance to exporters. This will be operated through the newly organized Foreign Credit Insurance Association -- a voluntary, unincorporated group of major United States insurance companies. The FCIA has entered into an agreement with the Export-Import Bank to issue coverage against commercial foreign credit risks in partnership with Eximbank, which will cover political risks.

The second program consists of a new system of guarantees to be issued by Eximbank directly to commercial banks and affiliated financial institutions undertaking the financing of exports. It is designed to encourage these banks to provide non-recourse financing of medium term credits, and to speed up these transactions by permitting the exporter to deal with his bank, rather than with Eximbank in Washington.

The objective of both programs is to assure that U.S. exporters will not lose sales because of a lack of credit facilities where the extension of credit is appropriate. I believe that American exporters will be more disposed to extend credit to their customers if they hold an export credit insurance policy issued through the FCIA, and that commercial banks will be prepared to discount such insured paper. Accordingly, our exporters, through use of the insurance and bank guarantee programs, will be better able to compete successfully with exporters in other countries on sales where credit is required by the customers overseas.

I am deeply appreciative of the splendid response of private industry in furthering the national interest in this area. Both the participating insurance companies and the commercial banks

you
the
ally
d by
un-
ately
now
many
ce, I
ire-
est.
ros-
use a
un-
ect a
scal-
low-
and
arily
sary
more
present
ower
on in

have rendered a public service through their cooperation in making these export credit facilities available as part of the national effort to improve the balance of payments to the United States.

50-MEGATON BOMB

Following is the text of an Oct. 30 White House statement on the Soviet detonation of a 50-megaton bomb: (See p. 1767)

At three thirty this morning, the Soviet Union detonated a very large nuclear device. Preliminary evidence indicates that its magnitude is on the order of 50 megatons. The explosion took place in the atmosphere. It will produce more radioactive fallout than any previous explosion.

The Soviet explosion was a political rather than a military act. The device exploded does not add in effectiveness against military targets to nuclear weapons now available both to the Soviet Union and the United States. It does not affect the basic balance of nuclear power. Any such weapon would be primarily a mass killer of people in war -- and the testing of this device primarily an incitement to fright and panic in the cold war.

In undertaking this test, the Soviet Union has deliberately overridden the expressed hope of the world as stated in the resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on October 28. It has done so because it intends through this display to spread such fear across the world that peace-loving men will accept any Soviet demand. Fear is the oldest weapon in history. Throughout the life of mankind, it has been the resort of those who could not hope to prevail by reason and persuasion. It will be repelled today, as it has been repelled in the past -- not only by the steadfastness of free men but by the power of the arms which men will use to defend their freedom.

There is no mystery about producing a 50-megaton bomb. Nor is there any technical need for testing such a weapon at full-scale detonation in order to confirm the basic design. The United States Government considered this matter carefully several years ago and concluded that such weapons would not provide an essential military capability. The existing United States nuclear arsenal is superior in quantity and quality to that of any other nation. The United States today has ample military power to destroy any nation which would unleash thermonuclear war.

We have no wish ever to use this military power. We are ready, now as ever, to sign the test-ban treaty proposed at Geneva. We are ready, now as ever, to negotiate a treaty for general and complete disarmament. In the meantime, we will continue to take whatever measures are necessary to preserve the security of our country and of others who count on us.

OTHER STATEMENTS

Other recent statements by President Kennedy (for previous statements, see p. 1782)

Oct. 11 -- Executive Order creating an emergency board under the Railway Labor Act to investigate a dispute between the Reading Co. and certain of its employees.

Oct. 11 -- Executive Order granting the Secretary of Interior responsibility for the administration of Palmyra Island, a group of islets in the Central Pacific.

Oct. 11 -- Amendment of Executive Order 10858, relating to the President's Committee for Traffic Safety.

Oct. 11 -- Grant of authority to the House Government Operations Committee during the 87th Congress to examine income, excess-profits, estate, and gift tax returns for the years 1947 to 1961. The authority requested by the Committee, was similar to that granted during the 86th Congress.

Oct. 11 -- Announcement of four additional cities in the Mid-West and West which would hold White House Regional Conferences in November.

Oct. 11 -- Announcement of the appointment of Gen. James A. Van Fleet as consultant to Secretary of the Army Elvis J. Stahr.

Oct. 11 -- Telegram to George Meany, AFL-CIO president, expressing delight that the labor federation had pledged to raise \$1 million for the Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Foundation.

Oct. 12 -- Remarks at Raleigh-Durham Airport, N.C. to the North Carolina Trade Fair.

Oct. 12 -- Announcement of a contract between the University of North Carolina and the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Defense Department providing \$1 million over the next four years for establishment of an interdisciplinary materials research program at Chapel Hill, N.C.

Oct. 12 -- Remarks at Fort Bragg, N.C. to the 82nd Airborne Division.

Oct. 13 -- Message of congratulations and support to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

Oct. 13 -- Acceptance of the resignation of Ulysees S. Grant III from the Civil War Centennial Commission and the appointment of Allan Nevins to replace him.

Oct. 16 -- Remarks on the arrival of President Urho Kekkonen of Finland at Andrews Air Force Base.

Oct. 16 -- Joint communique at the conclusion of talks with President Kekkonen.

Oct. 17 -- Statement in support of recommendations by a special Presidential commission appointed to seek a solution to the airline union dispute between pilots and flight engineers. The commission's report recommended merger of the two unions.

Oct. 17 -- Announcement of the appointment of Livingston T. Merchant, U.S. Ambassador to Canada, as personal Presidential representative to assist the Governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan in the solution of a border dispute which has tied up movement of goods moving to and from Afghanistan.

Oct. 18 -- Memorandum to the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor asking them to establish an Interagency Textile Administrative Committee to carry out the rights and obligations of the U.S. under the International Textile Agreement reached at Geneva July 21, 1961.

Oct. 19 -- Remarks on the arrival of President William V.S. Tubman of Liberia at the MATS Terminal.

Oct. 20 -- White House release of replies from four airline presidents declaring their support of recommendations by the Presidential commission on the airline union controversy.

Oct. 20 -- Announcement of the appointment of Clarence B. Bandall as a consultant to the Government to lead a special mission to review U.S. participation in Ghana's Volta River Project.

Oct. 21 -- Joint communique at the conclusion of talks with President Tubman.

Oct. 22 -- Announcement of the appointment of William S. Gaud, a New York lawyer, as Regional Administrator for the Near East and South Asia in the Agency for International Development.

Oct. 23 -- Letters to Office of Emergency Planning Director Frank B. Ellis and Governor Price Daniel of Texas amending the Sept. 16 "major disaster" declaration in Texas to include the county of Victoria and two subdivisions of Harris county.

Oct. 24 -- Remarks to Latin American archivists attending the Inter-American Archival Seminar.

Oct. 24 -- White House release of Oct. 10 letter to Pablo Casals asking him to give a concert at the White House Nov. 13, and Casals' Oct. 16 reply accepting the invitation.

Oct. 24 -- Letter of greetings to Walter P. Marshall, president of the Western Union Telegraph Co., at Omaha, Neb., ceremonies observing the 100th anniversary of completion of the first transcontinental telegraph line.

Oct. 24 -- Letter to President Ngo Dinh Diem of Viet-Nam on the sixth anniversary of the republic. The President said the U.S. "is determined to help Viet-Nam preserve its independence, protect its people against Communist assassins, and build a better life through economic growth."

Oct. 25 -- Announcement of approval of Project Gnome, a nuclear experiment which is part of the AEC's Plowshare Program to develop peaceful uses for nuclear explosives. The project contemplated detonation of a nuclear device about 1200 feet underground in a salt formation near Carlsbad, N.M. within two months.

Oct. 25 -- White House announcement that a special Presidential committee under the chairmanship of FAA Administrator N.E. Halaby appointed to review U.S. international aviation policy has awarded a joint contract to conduct a broad study of international aviation problems to Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc. and Systems Analysis and Research Corp.

Oct. 25 -- Letter of support to Henry B. Gonzalez Democratic candidate for the House of Representatives from the 20th District (San Antonio) of Texas in the special Congressional election Nov. 4.

Divided Democrats

Two Congressional Quarterly vote studies measure the split within the Democratic party -- the number of times a majority of Northerners and Southerners were on opposite sides of an issue -- and the phenomenon of a "conservative coalition" of the Southerners voting with a majority of the Republicans against the Northern Democrats. The North-South split study, which begins on p. 1806, shows that the two wings broke on 106 roll-call votes in 1961. The Coalition story, beginning on p. 1796, shows that 88 of these were coalition votes. Both studies give individual Members' scores and show the effect the voting had on President Kennedy's program.

Politics

ELECTIONS -- Tightening odds in the key New Jersey, New York City and Texas races and direct intervention by President Kennedy in two campaigns marked the final week of the 1961 election campaign. In an apparent reversal of intention, the President made personal appearances in New York City, where the GOP mayoralty candidate Louis J. Lefkowitz appeared to be gaining on incumbent Mayor Robert F. Wagner (D), and in New Jersey, where some polls indicated Democrat Richard J. Hughes had pulled even with James P. Mitchell (R) in the gubernatorial race. Observers also saw an increasingly close contest in Texas' 20th Congressional district between Henry B. Gonzalez (D) and John W. Goode Jr. (R) to fill the seat of ex-Rep. Paul J. Kilday (D). (Page 1818)

REDISTRICTING -- The Democratic-controlled redistricting committee of the Massachusetts Legislature released details of a conciliatory suggested Congressional redistricting plan for the state. (Page 1820)

MISCELLANY -- Ohio Gov. Michael V. DiSalle (D) announced that he would not run for re-election in 1962....John D. Alsop, brother of writers Joseph and Stewart, announced his candidacy for the Connecticut GOP gubernatorial nomination. (Page 1819)

Oldsters Lobby

President Kennedy has pledged to give the "highest priority" next year to the bill to provide medical care for the aged under Social Security. He'll have some help from a newly organized National Council of Senior Citizens for Health Care through Social Security. The group is headed by former Rep. Aime Forand, whose name identified earlier unsuccessful bills for health care for the aged. A CQ Fact Sheet describes the organization. (Page 1811)

Federal Judgeships

Of 78 federal judgeship nominations made so far by President Kennedy 75 have been Democrats. Thirty-four posts remain to be filled. A CQ Fact Sheet gives the background of judgeship legislation, discusses the use of judgeship posts as political patronage, and lists the posts which have been filled to date along with those which have not. (Page 1813)

Revised Budget

By conventional yardsticks, the federal budget will show a \$6.9 billion deficit for fiscal 1962, the Kennedy Administration announced Oct. 29. New military costs, payment of nearly \$1 billion in unanticipated farm subsidies and failure of Congress to increase postal rates were among the factors cited as pushing the deficit over the \$5.3 billion figure estimated earlier. President Kennedy called on all departments to hold the line on expenditures for the remainder of the year and stated his intention to balance the budget in fiscal 1963. (Page 1794)

In the Committees

The Policy Machinery Subcommittee issued its sixth and final report on the Government's cold war strategy, this one recommending stronger Presidential reliance on the Budget Bureau in establishing national priorities....a Senate Subcommittee held hearings on U.S. control of exports to Russia and the Soviet bloc....hearings on a bill to supplement the antitrust laws relating to drugs continued....and another Senate subcommittee resumed its hearings on packaging and labeling practices affecting consumers with the current series giving industry spokesmen a chance at defense. (Page 1816)

